

relative to patents on the Imhoff tanks; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Boise Commercial Club, Boise, Idaho, favoring Senate bill 313; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., urging tax exemption for bequests, legacies, and gifts to education, philanthropy, and religion; also a resolution of the Woman's Club, Waupaca, Wis., urging the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of 24 citizens of South Dakota and resolutions of the Americans' Loyalty League, of Huron, S. Dak., protesting against the zone system for second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials, relative to the patents on the Imhoff tank; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of the Swedish Evangelical Church of Edgewater, Chicago, Ill., against House bill 5712, for the protection and help of secret societies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of joint committee of Philadelphia trade bodies favoring retention of the pneumatic-tube postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Travelers' Protective Association of America; the Paris Literary Club, of Paris, Ky.; the Thursday Literary Club, of St. Albans, W. Va.; the Travelers' Club, of Newark, N. J.; the Woman's Century Club, of Nampa, Idaho; the Civic Club, of Philadelphia; the Seattle Class Journal Publishers' Association, of Seattle, Wash.; the Delta Shakespeare Club, of Lake Village, Ark.; the Somerset Chautauqua Circle, of Somerset, Ky.; the Missouri Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Massachusetts State Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Monday Club, of Webster Groves, Mo.; the Placerville Shakespeare Club, of Placerville, Cal.; the Granite State Dairymen's Association, of New Hampshire; the Woman's Club of Oregon City, Oreg.; the Woman's Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa; and the Fortnightly Literary Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., asking the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of American Defense Society, relative to charter of the German-American Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. J. Leinbach, master County Line Grange, No. 1751, of Boone County, Ill., relative to price fixing of farm products and the farm-labor problem; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 2150, to increase the pension of Joseph A. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of the Farm Labor Committee, State Council of Defense, urging methods for increasing the production of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of R. Everette Finnium, of Denver, Colo., praying for the passage of the Knutson bill, providing for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act which increases postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Fortnightly Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frances C. Farnsworth, Mary E. Springsteen, Mrs. Allison Stocker, Martha A. Croxby, Paul Brown, Peter J. Theisen, Mrs. Jesse Onyon, Charlotte V. Harvey, and 111 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Dietrich Bros., Baltimore, Md., favoring the establishment of aero mail service from Washington to New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Heywood Bros. and Wakefield Co., protesting against the passage of House bill 10591, to limit profits on house-furnishings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Randle Highlands Citizens' Association, in favor of utilization of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal for shipping purposes; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. OLNEY: Petition of druggists of Massachusetts for the enactment of House bill 5531, establishing a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions signed by many citizens of Massachusetts favoring House bill 5407; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, of Dublin, Ireland, and the principal cities of this country, asking that Ireland be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE: Memorial of Corp. Lucian D. Woodruff, Jr., Camp No. 64, United Spanish War Veterans, of Johnstown, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 1736, known as the Key bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of T. H. A. Moores, Rev. P. H. Williams, C. W. Cook, Ernest J. Wright, R. T. Schell, Isaac Peck, representing the Johnstown, Pa., branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying that the report of the congressional committee which investigated the St. Louis riots be published; to special committee.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Livingston County Pomona Grange, N. Y., with 1,470 members, unanimously urging the passage of emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions for war-emergency prohibition as a military necessity, as follows: Highland United Presbyterian Church, Second United Presbyterian Church, Central Presbyterian Church, Mahoning Methodist Episcopal Church, Primitive Methodist Church, Wesley and Simpson Churches, Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Free Methodist Church, First Baptist Church, and First Christian Church, all of New Castle, Pa.; also a petition of the same significance from the Woman's Club, Ellwood City, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

PUBLICATION OF CASUALTY LISTS (S. DOC. NO. 208).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of War in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, giving the reasons of the War Department for withholding places of residence of those whose names appear in the casualty lists. The communication will be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and also ordered printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

TO THE PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE

SIR: I am in receipt of Senate resolution under date of March 22, 1918, requesting me, if not inconsistent with the interest of the service, to inform the Senate if an order has been issued by the War Department to the effect that hereafter in publishing the casualty lists of the American Expeditionary Forces now abroad that the names of soldiers only would be given, withholding the announcement of their residence and next of kin; and if so, the reasons for such an order. I would inform you in reply that an order to that effect has been issued by the War Department.

The method pursued by the War Department with reference to information concerning casualties is the following:

First. To place in the hands of the nearest relative or the friend given by the soldier in his emergency address prompt and accurate information concerning the casualty before anything is given to the press.

Second. To prevent any information appearing in the papers which will be of any possible assistance to the German cause.

The old system, which gave the date of the casualty, enabled the Germans to get exactly what effect was produced upon our troops in a raid of that date. The publication of the address of the nearest relative or the emergency address did not give the relative any information which had not already been given to them, but it brought down upon them a swarm of claim agents, who guaranteed that they would obtain from the Government the war-risk insurance which is guaranteed by law to the proper inheritor, and in spite of the fact that the department has in each case advised the nearest relatives that their claims will be adjusted by the Government and that they will be furnished the money that is due them without the interposition of claim agents, numbers of poor people have yielded to the importunities of these claim agents, and are thereby deprived of a portion of what is justly their due. The department has also been informed by the Red Cross that relatives of men who are killed in France were the victims, under the system of giving their addresses publicly, of the most absurd propositions to make money, making their grief an object of exploitation.

The raids which are being conducted along our front are for the purpose of capturing a soldier, if possible, with the object of obtaining from him information about the organization which is opposed to the German lines at that point. With the publication of the address of the nearest relative, the German agents in the United States approach the relatives and obtain from them the very information which Germany is attempting to obtain along our front by attacks on our forces.

In France they publish no casualty lists at all, and the information reaches the relatives from the mayor of the town where the relatives live, who is required to communicate the facts to them verbally.

The matter of a change in our former method of publishing casualty lists was brought up by a cablegram from Gen. Pershing, in which he stated that representatives of the French Government had formally

protested against the methods that were then used, the specific case to which they referred being a statement given out by the War Department officially which permitted the Germans to know definitely the effect of gas shells on a certain date. The whole subject was then thoroughly studied and the decision reached to adopt the policy which is the subject of the Senate resolution.

Respectfully,

BENEDICT CROWELL,
Acting Secretary of War.

DEVICES FOR TAPPING TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE WIRES (S. DOC. NO. 207).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 19th instant, a report from the chief of the intelligence branch of the General Staff relative to any devices known to the War Department to prevent spies from tapping telegraph and telephone wires, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 209).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year 1919, in the sum of \$1,500, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota, transmitting a certified copy of a joint resolution ratifying the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

Certificate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, Frank M. Rood, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed senate joint resolution No. 1 was duly passed by the 1918 special session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, March 22, 1918.
[SEAL.]

FRANK M. ROOD,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded to the governor of this State, to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

A. C. ROBERTS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CHAS. M. GARDNER,
Chief Clerk.

Attest:

W. H. McMASTER,
President of the Senate.

W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within act originated in the senate, and was known in the senate files as senate joint resolution No. 1.

W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Office of Secretary of State, ss:

Filed March 22, 1918, at 3:40 o'clock p. m.

FRANK M. ROOD,
Secretary of State.
By GEO. F. SAYERS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer:

S. 389. An act to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.; and

H. R. 9867. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

COAL OUTPUT IN COLORADO.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a couple of telegrams from my State bearing upon the coal situation, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO., March 23, 1918.

Senator CHARLES THOMAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the National Fuel Administration put in effect March 11, 1918, an order drastically reducing the scale of maximum prices to be charged for Colorado coal, and whereas as a result of such order a large number of mines, which could only be operated at a loss at the prices fixed March 11, have been closed down, and others will be forced to discontinue or curtail operations, resulting in a reduction of the output of Colorado coal of at least 4,000,000 tons for 1918, as estimated by the operators, and whereas coal is one of the essentials for the winning of the war, and its production should be stimulated by the fixing of prices that will yield a reasonable profit and permit the intensive operation of all mines, a policy which has been recommended in fixing the prices for other commodities—steel, copper, wheat, etc.—now, therefore, the Business Men's League of Glenwood Springs respectfully petitions the National Fuel Administration to reconsider its order effective March 11, 1918, and to promptly restore the scale of maximum prices effective immediately prior thereto.

BUSINESS MEN'S LEAGUE,
C. R. MCCARTHY, President.

DENVER, COLO., March 24, 1918.

Senator C. S. THOMAS,
343 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Answering your wire, received yesterday, information furnished by operators of 14 idle mines in Walsenburg and Trinidad districts indicates date of resumption of work by them is indefinite. General reason for closing down is prices authorized by Fuel Administration. Purchases are now delayed so that buyers may take advantage of new prices effective April 1. Mines where orders have been canceled up to April 1 so as to take advantage of new prices have closed down during the interval on account of high cost of day labor to keep them open during idle times. Some operators state operation under present wages and cost of material is so expensive as to leave practically no margin. Under the new prices established by the Fuel Administration these properties, it is said, will remain closed until prices are resumed in August on the old basis. As further stated in my message of the 21st, dealers with no coal on hand are advising their customers to hold off until lower prices go into effect. Dealers with coal on hand are anxious to release now on coal they have in stock, paid for at prices in force prior to the reduction. There is absolutely no question but that these conditions are causing labor to leave the State, where they can secure employment permitting full time.

H. VANMETER.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JAMES. I desire to present numerous petitions sent to me from various counties in Kentucky signed by thousands of our fellow citizens, praying for the passage of a law to curb the activities of German propagandists and spies in the United States. I ask that one of the petitions, all of which are practically the same, be printed in the RECORD. I shall not ask that the names be printed, as they are too numerous, but that all of the petitions be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of them was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[American Defense Society, State of Kentucky. Petition of the people of the United States of America to the Congress at Washington.]

Whereas the security of the United States and the success of our arms are endangered by the activities of disloyal persons and organizations within the borders of our country, we, the citizens of the United States whose names are hereto subscribed, do hereby petition the Congress of

the United States to enact forthwith a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or for the publication or public utterance of statements tending—

To impede or interfere with the operations or success of the United States in war or in recruiting or enlistment, or

To hold the Government of the United States or any of our allies up to ridicule or obloquy, or

To cause disloyalty or refusal of duty on the part of any person in connection with the war.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Eugene, Oreg., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the Woman's Suffrage Party of Center County, Pa., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the seventh ward of Philadelphia, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of the fifth ward of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the adoption of a Federal suffrage amendment, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Birdsboro, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Trafford, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of sundry churches of New Castle and Shickshinny, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Bucks County Fish, Game, and Forestry Association, of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the repeal of the present game laws, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Greybull, Wyo., and a petition of sundry citizens of Basin, Wyo., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Local Branch of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, of Ann Arbor, Mich., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Free Methodist Church, of Bad Axe, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making it unlawful to deposit in the mails certain matter to expose the secret work of fraternal orders, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Onsted, Mich., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4198) to authorize the county of Okanogan, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4199) granting a pension to Edward D. Hagen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4200) to establish in the District of Columbia a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 4201) to authorize the Columbia Railway & Navigation Co. to construct a canal connecting the Santee River and the Cooper River, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for professional and scientific books, law books, and other books of reference relating to the business of the Department of the Interior, from \$1,000 to \$1,500, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing that in addition to the increases in salary provided for in section 6 of the legislative appropriation bill a further allowance of \$12 per annum shall be granted to every such civilian employee of the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia

for each child below the age of 16 years dependent entirely upon him for support, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9414. An act granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	Norris	Stone
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Nugent	Sutherland
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Thomas
Caldwell	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thompson
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Robinson	Tillman
Colt	Kenyon	Shafroth	Trammell
Culberson	Knox	Sheppard	Underwood
Curtis	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Fall	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Frolinghuysen	McNary	Smith, Md.	Watson
Gallinger	Martin	Smoot	Wolcott
Harding	Myers	Sterling	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT). I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FRANCE, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KING, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McLEAN, Mr. NEW, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. JAMES entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the committee at the foot of page 75, to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the amendment is that relating to the Yakima Indian Reservation and the Wapato project. I discussed it at considerable length yesterday afternoon, and I am just going to summarize practically what was said then, because many Senators are now present who were absent at that time. The House committee and the House put in a provision of \$500,000 for carrying on this project. The Senate committee proposes to reduce it to \$250,000.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Secretary of the Interior considered this as being so important that last summer at the extra session of Congress he sent down an estimate recommending an emergency appropriation of \$750,000 to carry on the project. It could not be taken up at the extra session. The recommendation was renewed this year by the department, and they submitted an estimate of \$750,000.

In the debate in the House in connection with this item my recollection is that the chairman of the committee, or at any rate one of the members of the House committee, referred to it as the best irrigation project in the United States, stating that the Government gets more for every dollar expended than upon any other project. I wish to call the attention of Senators to the statement of Senators yesterday on the floor, members of the committee, to the effect that this is one of the best irrigation projects in the United States, and no objection to it upon the merits are offered here.

Under the provision as reported by the Senate committee we can reclaim on this reservation during the next year, according to the estimate of the superintendent in charge, only about 8,000 acres of land. If the provision made by the House is allowed to stand, according to those estimates, as I understand them, we

could reclaim next year at least 20,000 acres of land. It is estimated that with the amount of \$750,000 recommended, 30,000 acres could be reclaimed. This land will produce on an average 50 bushels of wheat to the acre. The income per acre from the land this last year was \$100; that is, from the land irrigated and under cultivation. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that without irrigation this land is absolutely desert—it will produce nothing.

The fact was brought out in connection with the lands in Montana on yesterday that some of the Indians are opposing the appropriations for the reclamation of lands, because the land would produce good crops without irrigation. That is not the case with reference to these lands. As I said, these lands are absolutely desert, they produce nothing until they are irrigated. So the longer we leave these lands without irrigation they will be uncultivated and unproductive. Every acre that has water now is cultivated, and just as soon as we get additional acreage under water that acreage will be cultivated.

This is the cheapest construction in connection with irrigation anywhere in the country. That has been the case heretofore, and the continuation of it will be the same. What will be done with this money is simply the extension of canals already made. Some of the Senators who have visited this locality, as they did a few years ago as members of a joint commission to look into it, know the character of the country, know the character of the soil; that the excavation is largely by machine work; that we get more for a dollar expended than almost anywhere else; that the lands are comparatively level; that the canals are put in almost on a direct line, and we simply extend the main line, and then all we have to do is to take laterals out to cover the land.

The Government has already expended in satisfying the claims of the Indians \$500,000, carrying \$100,000 in this bill, and has obligated itself to pay an additional \$135,000 to get water for these lands. We have expended also a little over \$400,000 in commencing this work. The ultimate cost of it for distribution will be two or three million dollars. The only objection, as I understand it, that is made by the committee is upon the ground of economy, upon the ground of holding the appropriations down. Mr. President, I recognize the view of the committee. I sympathize with the view of the committee for economy, and I am in favor of holding appropriations down where to hold them down does not create waste.

Furthermore, it seems to me the situation here and what can be accomplished by the expenditure of this money justifies this expenditure and justifies its expenditure now. It is urged by the State council of defense. It is deemed so important that the Secretary of the Interior sent it in as a special recommendation last summer at the extra session. It will increase the production of food produced and means much in the prosecution of the war, and also especially to these Indians and in the development of this project in the most economical way it means much, because those who have observed the manner of carrying on Government work have been unanimous in the opinion that when we carry the work on by piecemeal it is the most extravagant way by which it can be carried on, and that the ultimate result is that instead of saving money we waste it. That would be the result in connection with this proposition.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he has any estimate of the increase which will be necessary to carry on the work at this time. In other words, how much will the cost of material and labor be increased by carrying on the work now as compared with prewar conditions?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yesterday I read from the report of the superintendent who has charge of this irrigation matter and of this reservation, Mr. Holt, touching that very point, and I will read it to the Senator.

The question has arisen as to what effect the high cost of labor and materials will have on the total cost of the project. While this might increase the cost to some extent, the 20 per cent added to all estimates for contingencies is thought to be sufficient to cover any increased cost on account of labor and materials being higher than usual.

It is the custom of the Indian Office in making up their estimate for work of this kind, after they have made detailed estimates to add a percentage of 10 or 20 per cent to cover emergencies and contingencies, and that is what was done in this case. The superintendent states that that will cover the increased cost on account of material, and so forth.

I want to say, as Mr. Holt suggests here, that whatever the cost may be it will all be paid back to the Government in the

end, because the actual cost of doing this work and putting in this construction is assessed against the land to be benefited.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose the Senator from Washington understands that the cost of the entire project will be distributed among all of the property owners, those owning land under the project, does he not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Well, will that not then have a tendency to increase, and will it not very greatly increase the cost to those people who now have their lands under cultivation, and which lands have been put under irrigation when prices of labor and material were much less than they will be for the additional work?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They may have to pay a little bit more; that is true; but they are willing to do it; and it is but fair that they should do it. They should not hold this work back.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he has had any expression in reference to that matter from those who now have land under cultivation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I certainly have not heard of any opposition from them—not a word. As a matter of fact, all of the people on this reservation are earnestly and heartily in favor of this appropriation at this time; in fact, those who are urging it are largely those who have lands already irrigated. They are simply looking at it not alone from a patriotic standpoint, of course; but, if you can call it so, from a selfish standpoint—from the selfish standpoint of seeing the country developed and seeing these lands reclaimed. They know that it may mean a little bit greater cost to them, which they will have to pay, but they do not oppose that.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But does not the Senator think it will cost very much more?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think so; and I will tell the Senator why. I know the locality there. As I said a while ago, this is a very easy construction. It is largely just mere excavation. You can take a shovel and shovel it out. There is not much rock, and as to the greater part of it there is no rock at all. They get the work done largely by people who live there, people upon the farms, and they do not charge the increased price per diem that you have to pay to men in different vocations who come in largely from the outside. Of course there is some increased cost; there is no question about that; labor is scarce in our section; but, as I said on yesterday, there will be no trouble about labor so far as getting a sufficient amount of labor not only to do this work but to cultivate the land that will be brought under cultivation and to harvest the crops. They will do it. Our people are going out in that section in families doing the work of the community that is necessary to be done in order to put in crops and to harvest crops. Many people who heretofore have not been working very much, who have been taking it pretty easy, have gone out to work, and they will do it now. So, as an actual fact, the real increase in cost under the present conditions of this project will not be very great. I am satisfied that the superintendent in the statement that he has made has correctly described the situation.

Mr. President, I feel that I have covered this matter as fully as I can cover it. I am not going to take the time of the Senate further. I believe that the basis upon which the committee acted with reference to this amendment is not really justifiable; that to carry the amount at least that was provided by the House will in the end be a matter of economy. Furthermore, I believe that the benefits that will come to the Government, to the Indians, and to the reservation will far more than justify the inclusion at least of the amount provided by the House, and will justify the rejection of the amendment of the committee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I feel like repenting in regard to this amendment, which reduces the appropriation carried by the bill for a project in the State of Washington, what I took occasion to say on yesterday in regard to a similar reduction of an appropriation for a project in the State of Montana, with this difference, however, that it is conceded by the committee, conceded by the Reclamation Service, and by everyone who is interested in irrigation and in this bill, that the Yakima Valley Irrigation system, of which the Wapato project is a unit, is the most successful and the most fruitful in its results by actual demonstration, in so far as it has already been developed, of any project that has been undertaken by the Government in this great policy of reclaiming the arid lands of the West.

The amount that is carried by the bill as it came to the Senate is considerably less than was the amount carried for the project in Montana—\$500,000—and it is urged by those who have to do this work that this amount is essential for the economical progress of the work.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Washington has stated that the amount was less than that carried in the Montana item. I think the Senator is mistaken. The amount was reduced to \$250,000 in the Montana item, the same as it is in this.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I think the Senator from Kansas misunderstood what I said. The House bill carried \$750,000 for the Montana project, but it only carried \$500,000 for this project.

Mr. CURTIS. That is true.

Mr. POINDEXTER. So we are only asking for \$500,000, the amount that was provided by the other House.

The only ground that I have heard urged for the committee action in substituting \$250,000 for \$500,000 is economy. There are a good many business men in the Senate, and I submit to any business man, if he has undertaken any business enterprise, has committed himself to it, has put his capital into it, has determined that that enterprise requires a certain amount of money for its completion, whether there is any economy in stinting the supply of funds for carrying on work to a point which cripples the progress of it. On the other hand, any good business man will say that it is more economical to provide sufficient funds to maintain his organization without interruption and to secure the best appliances to complete the work at the earliest possible time. So the dictates of economy, it seems to me, would be in favor of maintaining this appropriation rather than reducing it.

If this were a question of whether or not we were going to commit ourselves to a new project, it would be a very different thing, but we have committed ourselves to this project. It is not a new project; we have already expended a great deal of money on it, and a certain amount more is necessary to complete it. We will not get the returns that were anticipated and which were the justification for undertaking this project until it is completed. I have always thought, about any irrigation enterprise, that sound judgment required the fullest possible development of the enterprise at the earliest possible moment, because in that way only can you begin to get the fullest measure of returns—in this case, the wheat or the other crops which would be grown upon these lands. We need them and we can not get them until the work is finished. By retaining in the bill the amount which was provided by the House the work will be finished sooner and we will get the returns sooner.

From every standpoint it seems to me that such a policy is far preferable to making appropriations in dribbles and allowing the organization which may have been formed to carry on the work to deteriorate and go to pieces, and then have to get it together again. The history of our river and harbor improvements has demonstrated the fallacy of the idea that it is economy to make small annual appropriations for completing a work which the Government has undertaken, to which it is committed, and which it is going to carry on to completion. Time and time again have these works been closed down and the organization of employees has gone to pieces, and then, when another small annual appropriation was made, the Government had to go out and at great expense get new men, educate them in the work, organize them, and start up again. In many instances a very large percentage of the appropriation—as would be the case in this instance if the same principle is adopted and only \$250,000 is appropriated—would be expended in getting ready to go on with the work. Now, after we have gotten ready we ought to have enough money to go on with the enterprise rather than to have to stop again and let the organization be dissipated, and then have to gather it together again when another appropriation is made.

For these reasons I think that it is sound economy to reject the committee amendment and to follow the action of the House of Representatives and the recommendations of the executive department.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Committee on Indian Affairs had before it a very difficult problem in considering these irrigation enterprises. There is not a member of the committee, so far as I am aware, who is not thoroughly in favor of the reclamation of arid lands by irrigation. There were a number of projects under consideration by the committee and they were all considered meritorious. The degree of

merit was not considered by the committee very carefully, but they were treated as meritorious projects as a whole.

There was not any doubt in the minds of the committee that the project in the State of Washington was meritorious, likewise the one in Montana, and others in Arizona and in Wyoming; and if these had been ordinary times I do not think that there is any question that the committee would have recommended all the appropriations which had been asked for. We felt that the work ought to be done at some time, but we were confronted with this problem: That at this time the Nation is in need of all the money that can be had for immediate purposes in the war. It was recognized not only that the money could be used for other purposes but if money were diverted for the purpose of extending these irrigation enterprises it would have to result in the use of material and labor. I think it is generally understood over the country that labor is short, and that if there is a surplus of labor in any one locality it can find a very strong demand in some other section of the country. The same thing may be said of materials; and the labor which is required to manufacture the machinery to do the work of carrying on or further extending these irrigation projects was felt, by the committee at least, to be needed, and the need was of an intense nature that that labor should be diverted elsewhere.

Not only that, but it was felt that to do the work would incur an expense of from 50 to 100 per cent in excess of what similar work would require in ordinary times. I listened to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] when he read the estimate of the additional cost; and I must say that the committee felt that the increased cost would be much greater than that indicated by the estimate. Under all the circumstances, however, we felt that the money should not go into these enterprises further than was necessary to keep them as going concerns.

The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], who last spoke, said that this was not like a new enterprise. It is a new enterprise in one sense of the term; it is an extension of an existing system. We might illustrate that by using an instance where a man wanted to build a house with 10 rooms and had already constructed 5 rooms to the house and completed them. So far as the additional five rooms are concerned, it would be a new house. That is our understanding of the situation of this project in the State of Washington, and to that extent it would be a new project.

The amount of money proposed to be appropriated by the committee amendment was deemed by the committee to be adequate to keep up the work, to maintain the organization, and save the whole organization from being disintegrated, as has been suggested.

If Senators will understand the spirit in which the committee has acted, it seems to me that the appropriation of \$250,000, which has been suggested by the committee for that project, ought to be enough. If it is not enough for that project, then the committee undoubtedly has done wrong with respect to the other projects, and if the Senate chooses to increase this appropriation, then it seems to me we should reconsider the action which was taken upon yesterday and go back to the Montana, the Wyoming, the Arizona, and other projects in other sections and increase the appropriations made for them.

We cut down these appropriations everywhere, and if you are not going to accept that as the proper action, then I think by all means we should reconsider the action taken by the Senate upon yesterday. I certainly would feel that that should be done, and would be glad personally to move a reconsideration of the action for which we voted on yesterday.

These matters, however, were gone into by the committee in the best of good faith. We realized the importance of these irrigation projects. We felt that at a proper time they ought to be carried out, but we felt further that the absolute necessity for conserving resources at this time, conserving the money, and conserving the materials and the labor which the money will represent was so great that we ought to forego these extensions upon a large scale. This project, as we understand it, will not be seriously injured. Some work will go ahead. The project is a going concern now, and it is simply a curtailment upon the extension. I feel that the committee ought to be sustained in this matter if it is to be sustained in any of these matters.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, just one word. There is, I think, one very important feature of this matter to which I have not called attention, but which I did call to the attention of the Indian Affairs Committee in executive session, and that is this:

There is not any article of food that we need more than sugar. Day in and day out there is urged upon us the importance of saving sugar and the very great need of it. The sugar industry

is just developing in this section. Last year for the first time a beet-sugar factory was opened up at Yakima, just a little over a mile from the boundary of this reservation. On this reservation now they are constructing another beet-sugar factory, and about 25 miles away, but off the reservation, they are constructing another one. The development of this project is necessary for the success of the development of that industry in that locality; and while, as I said, there is a necessity for economy, there is also a necessity for food—not only for wheat, that we can produce there at the rate of 50 bushels to the acre, but for the production of sugar, that will be stimulated, encouraged, and developed by the reclamation of these lands.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I stated upon yesterday that the committee had treated all these irrigation projects alike. The committee were influenced by the fact that they thought it was necessary to reduce the appropriations to the lowest possible point. They were also influenced, as has been well stated by the Senator from New Mexico, by the high cost of material. But it seems to me there is an additional reason why this amendment should be defeated.

In the bill a year ago there was an item of \$200,000 for this project. There remained unexpended of that amount at the time the hearings were held by the House committee in December last \$188,000, and so, with the \$250,000 given in this bill and the \$188,000 unexpended balance, it gives to this project \$438,000. Now, in view of the fact that the projects in the State represented by the chairman of the committee, the project in the State represented by another member of the committee—Wyoming—and the projects in other States where members of the committee urged them, were reduced, it seems to me only fair that the committee should be sustained.

It is true, as stated by both the Senators from Washington, that perhaps the Yakima project is the best—in fact, it is the best—irrigation project on Indian lands in the United States.

My recollection is, from looking up this question last year, that every acre under the project where water was available was cultivated last year. But with nothing done on this new unit of 120,000 acres, and with \$188,000 unexpended balance for last year, surely the Senator from Washington will not contend that enough work could be done to raise any sugar upon this land by sugar-beet farming next year; and I think, in view of the fact that there is \$188,000 unexpended balance of the \$200,000 appropriated last year, the \$250,000 recommended by the committee is sufficient for this year.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I just want to say, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas, that this \$188,000 will all be gone by the 1st of July, when this \$250,000 is available. It has all been contracted, and the work is going on, and it will be expended before the 1st of July.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, for year—in fact, ever since I have been a Member of this body—I have uniformly urged adequate appropriations for the completion of reclamation projects. I have always been a believer in the speedy completion of those projects, and I shall raise my voice and give my vote in behalf of this project and against the pending committee amendment.

I am a believer in adequate appropriations for reclamation projects and the speedy completion of them, no matter where they may be located, whether in my State or in another State; that has been my attitude and my course ever since I have been a Member of this body. I believe that any reclamation project, wherever located, if a meritorious project, ought to be completed as speedily as possible; if it is not meritorious it should not have been authorized by Congress nor embarked upon. The fact that these projects have been started is conclusive evidence that they are meritorious, because they are carefully looked into, the nature of the country ascertained, the character of the soil ascertained, the cost estimated, and the probable results computed, before the projects are authorized. The Reclamation Service looks into those things, and I do not think it can be charged with undertaking unfeasible or unworthy projects; and the fact that projects are authorized and begun shows that there is merit in them. At least, that is the time when the merit of the projects should be determined; and having been determined to be meritorious, I believe they should be treated like any other enterprise under either public or private supervision. They should be rushed to completion as soon as possible. If there is any benefit to be gained by the completion of them, it ought to be attained as soon as possible.

I believe in applying that principle to affairs in private life as well as in public life. If a man is going to open up a farm and bring it to tillable condition, I believe he should clear the land, fence it, improve it, break it, and put it into crops and put it to some useful purpose as soon as possible, and carry on the work as rapidly as possible. Somebody is going to be benefited by it. I believe the benefits ought to be derived as soon as

possible, and I believe that to appropriate less than \$500,000 per year to a large reclamation project is unwise economy. If you drag the appropriations over a great number of years, the overhead charges are much greater and the cost of construction to the homesteaders is much more per acre than if the work is rushed to speedy completion. I do not believe that in time of war we should abandon all of our domestic improvements, especially those that relate to agriculture, which is the basis of our prosperity and must be the basis of winning the war. I believe it is not only justifiable but advisable to give our reclamation projects liberal appropriations.

Holding these views, I take pleasure in joining the Senator from Washington in opposing the committee amendment. I hope it may be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I do not know that there is anyone in public life who was more intimately connected with the inception of the irrigation system than I was, and I have been a diligent and constant laborer in efforts to advance that great enterprise. Just last night I received a telegram from the board of supervisors in the county in which I live asking for an appropriation of some \$50,000 to be placed on the Indian appropriation bill for the purpose of building a road through the Papago Reservation, up to the line of which the State has already built almost a boulevard, a perfect road. From there on for a great distance there is no road at all. It is an Indian reservation, where the State could not intrude itself, and I have been appealed to to see what I could do toward getting this road built.

I have made some inquiry and tested somewhat the feeling of the Committee on Indian Affairs. They have revealed to me such conditions that I do not feel that I could ask at this particular time for the construction of that road, although it is very much needed. I must take occasion here also to testify to my confidence in that committee and to commend the course they have pursued in their efforts to keep alive these projects, giving them all they could. Notwithstanding my own inclination in the matter and the fact that it is a case arising in my own State, I do not feel that I could ask for this appropriation, at least at this time, although I know its necessity. So I am constrained to stand by the committee, however much I should like to aid the great project for which the Senators from Washington are standing now. Having felt obliged to forego my desire for my own State in the matter, I can not help but sustain the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the yeas seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who has not voted, and for that reason I withhold my vote. If the Senator from Florida later votes, I will then record my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent, due to illness in his family.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMPSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELPS] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORE] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when Mr. WALSH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GERRY (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New York has not voted.

Mr. GERRY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and let my vote stand.

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. HARDING. I note the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair, and therefore I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Henderson	McLean	Swanson
Baird	James	Martin	Thomas
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Thompson
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Tillman
Curtis	Kenyon	Nugent	Trammell
Fall	King	Page	Vardaman
France	Kirby	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Gerry	Knox	Shields	Watson
Gore	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gronna	McKellar	Sutherland	

NAYS—10.

Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	Warren
Cummins	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Frelinghuysen	Myers	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—46.

Bankhead	Harding	Owen	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hardwick	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Hitchcock	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Hollis	Pittman	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	Pomerene	Stone
Culberson	Kellogg	Ransdell	Townsend
Dillingham	La Follette	Reed	Underwood
Fernald	Lewis	Robinson	Walsh
Fletcher	Lodge	Saulsbury	Weeks
Gallinger	McNary	Sherman	Williams
Goff	Nelson	Simmons	
Hale	Overman	Smith, Ga.	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the action of the conferees on the part of the Senate upon Senate joint resolution 133. The joint resolution passed the Senate, and in the House it was amended by certain provisos. The Senate disagreed to the amendments and appointed conferees. The conference committee met and, after going over the matter with the House conferees, the Senate conferees determined that the proper course was for the Senate to recede from its disagreement and agree to the House amendments. Therefore we present this resolution to the Senate:

Resolved, That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to Senate joint resolution 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the title of the joint resolution be stated.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved Septem-

ber 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator why the conference report does not come in in the usual form.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Where the conferees of the Senate agree to the action of the House no conference report is necessary. The House will not be called upon to act upon the subject at all again. We, as conferees, agreed, and the House conferees do not join in the report. We are following the action taken by the Senate in the Sixty-fourth Congress on Senate bill 35 and Senate bill 36. The Senate conferees concluded that they would recommend to the Senate to agree to the House amendments and no conference report is necessary to the House. This action by the Senate will terminate the consideration of the measure and the bill will become a law upon receiving the signature of the President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been interrogating the Senator from Georgia, and I want to ask him one or two further questions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the resolution which the Senator now offers is agreed to by the Senate, will it be transmitted to the House of Representatives showing our action? In other words—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The transmission to the House is notice from the Senate that the Senate has agreed to the House amendments. It takes the place exactly of our having agreed in the first instance to the House amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. It quite surprises me that we ever have disposed of a conference in that way, but if there is a precedent for it, as the Senator says, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My own first suggestion was to submit a conference report, but I was advised that the practice has been to the contrary, and I was given these two citations. I find that in the course I am taking now we are pursuing exactly the same course that was pursued in the last Congress. I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] made at least one of the reports.

Mr. GALLINGER. It simply struck me as being an unusual course of procedure, and for that reason I raised the question. Perhaps it is just as well. I am not going to push the matter any further.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It struck me also as unusual at first, but I realized the soundness of the view when I found the precedents had been in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I was a member of the conference, but on account of being compelled to attend a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations this morning at the same time the conferees on the joint resolution met I was not aware as to the action taken by the conferees until this moment.

I do not remember ever having made any conference report in the way the Senator has just stated, nor do I remember of one ever having been made in that way. I wonder how the House will know the action of the Senate. The Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House and asked for a conference with the House. The House granted the conference, and it seems to me that the only way that the records can be clear is for the conferees appointed by the House to make a report upon the disagreement between the two Houses upon the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senate now passes the resolution receding from its disagreement and notifies the House that it has receded from its disagreement, that gives the House a record that the necessity for the conference has ceased, and the House then simply discharges its conferees. So I was advised by one whom I thought knew.

Mr. SMOOT. I would very much prefer to have made a regular conference report; but if the Senate adopts the resolution proposed by the Senator from Georgia and the Senate will notify the House of the action taken by the conferees on the part of the Senate, I shall not further object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that on Senate bill 35, July 19, 1916, a similar motion was made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to agree to the House amendments and that the Secretary was further ordered to notify the House of Representatives. So it appears that such a resolution would be in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Was not that motion made before the matter went to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be the record and that may have been the course taken, but I will say frankly I do not remember it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That record was the one brought to me as an argument against the course that I had intended to pursue, which was to submit a conference report; and also I had cited the action on Senate bill 36. I was also assured by the Senate employee, who is very efficient as to precedents, that that had been the precedent, and if I pursued the course I had contemplated pursuing I would be pursuing an unnecessary course. I was satisfied this would accomplish the result, and I was not particular about the way.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely want to say that I certainly was mistaken in my opinion when I asked for such an order of the Senate. I believe it would have been better at that time to have made a conference report, just as I believe it would be the proper course to make a conference report now.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what motion he is making at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The motion I am making is that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to Senate joint resolution No. 133.

Mr. POINDEXTER. How can the Senate consider that joint resolution when the joint resolution is not before the Senate? The joint resolution is in the committee of conference.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The conferees report to the Senate and ask that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is quite a different proposition. I asked the Senator what his motion was, and he stated an entirely different kind of a motion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the conferees make a report to the Senate that removes the entire controversy.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have reported from the Senate conferees that after conferring with the House conferees we believed it was best that the Senate should recede from its disagreement and accept the House amendments, and therefore I offered the resolution by direction of the Senate conferees.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is a pretty important matter, because it involves the procedure of conference committees. If the Senator from Georgia makes a motion to recede from the disagreement of the Senate to the House amendments to the joint resolution I will make a point of order against the motion, because the joint resolution is not before the Senate, it is in committee of conference, but if the Senator makes a report from the conference committee no point of order would lie in my judgment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I report from the Senate conferees, not from the House conferees. As the Senate conferees accept all the House amendments and are ready for the Senate to recede entirely there is no occasion of agreement required, because we accept all the amendments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is somewhat difficult to get this matter in a definite shape and hold it there for any length of time. I think there are three different propositions now that the Senator from Georgia has made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The first was the motion he made as a Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The second was the report of the conference committee, and the third that he now makes is a report of the Senate conferees, without ever having held a meeting or conferred with the House conferees. I make a point of order against that, Mr. President, for the reason that the Senate conferees have no jurisdiction to consider the matter or to make a report on it except as members of the conference committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have been unfortunate in my statement, in that I have not been able to make the Senator from Washington understand what we have done. I do not think he has heard what I have said.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I only—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. At the opening of my statement I advised the Senate that the Senate conferees had met with the conferees of the House, and as a result of their conference they had reached the conclusion that the Senate should accept all the House amendments, and there was no occasion for an agreement between them.

Mr. POINDEXTER rose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. Let me finish and let the Senator understand what I mean.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not going to interrupt the Senator before he has finished.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Our conclusion was that we should recede entirely and accept all that the House had done. No agreement was required. We yielded entirely. They agreed to nothing; they yielded nothing. That was the peculiarity of the situation. Under those circumstances we come back to the Senate, as the representatives of the Senate, with the joint resolution and say an agreement between the conferees was not necessary, because as a result of the conference we recommend complete yielding by the Senate and that the Senate accept all the amendments referred to the conference adopted in the House, and as a representative of the Senate conferees I moved the adoption of the resolution which I read. Now I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Georgia and his associates, if they are agreeing with him on this question, have assumed a function either of the Senate or of the conference committee. What right did the gentlemen whom the Senate appointed as its representatives on a conference committee have to decide this question and report back here that we decide that the House amendments should be agreed to?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We do not do that at all. The Senate has to decide it. We come back to the Senate and say, as your conferees, we recommend that the Senate shall accept the entire amendments of the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make a point of order against that, Mr. President, for the reason—and I should like it to be distinct in the Record—that the joint resolution is not before the Senate. Now, the Senator from Georgia has reiterated that he is not reporting from the conference committee, but that the representatives of the Senate who were directed to sit on a conference committee have arrogated to themselves the authority of saying they will not do that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We did do it. We did sit with them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why did you not make a report, then?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We did not make a joint report because it was only necessary as the result of our action to report to the Senate. We did not require an agreement, because they yielded nothing; we yielded everything. Therefore we reported to the Senate that our recommendation to the Senate was that we accept all that the House had done.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator tell us where the joint resolution is at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the Senate here.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is lying on my desk. We had the joint resolution and we brought it back.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I make the suggestion that there is only one authority which can bring the joint resolution back to the Senate. The Senate committed this joint resolution to a committee of conference. Now, it is in the same status there that a joint resolution would be if it were committed by the Senate to any other committee, even to a committee of the Senate. It remains in that committee until it is reported back to the Senate by the committee.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has stated several times that the committee took no action, but that the Senate members of the committee took some action. He now asks that the action taken by the Senate members of the committee be ratified by the Senate, and that the Senate agree to the House amendment to this joint resolution. The joint resolution being in the committee of conference, and the committee of conference having made no report, I submit that the Senate can not act on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that it is perfectly proper for a conference committee of the Senate to make a report to the Senate whenever it sees fit to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Georgia has presented to the Senate the papers from the House of Representatives?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have.

Mr. SMOOT. And they are before the Senate now?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are before the Senate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is entirely proper for a committee of conference to make a report; that the committee may make a report to the Senate at any time and offer a resolution upon it. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas, the Chair believes, arose first and therefore he is recognized. Mr. CURTIS. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the document entitled "Conferences and conference reports," section 20 of which says:

While a conference asked by the House was in progress on the House's disagreement to Senate amendments, by a special order the House discharges its conferees, recedes from its disagreement, and agreed to the amendment.

So it seems under that rule the proper course to pursue is for the Senator from Georgia to ask that the conferees be discharged and that the Senate recede from its disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is necessarily the effect of the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is exactly what I am asking.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to be heard?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I desire to say a word, because I think this is a matter of some consequence. It is certainly going to upset the established usage of this body if we dispose of conference reports in this way. I turn, Mr. President, to the manual of Mr. Cleaves, which was adopted by the Senate, Mr. Cleaves having prepared this manual when he was clerk to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. On page 347 it says:

In drafting a conference report care should be taken in stating the action of the conferees on amendments to observe the parliamentary rule that neither House can recede from or insist on its own amendment with an amendment—

And so forth.

That was the opinion of Mr. Cleaves, who drafted that manual, which the Senate adopted.

It would have been a very easy matter to have made this report in the usual form—that the Senate recede from its amendment and the House agree to that action. It would have come here, been agreed to, and gone to the other House, and the House Members would have been informed of the fact that the Senate had receded from its amendment. That is simply the usual parliamentary way; but if we are going to adopt a new method—possibly it is a short cut to disposing of a conference report—I have an impression that it will not save any time, but will really establish a new way for conferees to act when they have an important duty put upon them by their respective Houses.

That is all I have to say about the matter. I have an impression that the point of order ought to have been sustained, but the Chair has ruled otherwise and I have no disposition to contest the wisdom of the Chair.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Chair permit me merely to make a brief observation in order to seek to justify the point of order which I made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question? I merely want to get at one fact.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In regard to this matter?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Georgia whether this joint resolution is in the House of Representatives or in the Senate? Who asked for the conference?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate asked for the conference.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not remember which House asked for the conference.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the House agreed to the conference, are not the papers in the House of Representatives by parliamentary law?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where they ought to be.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the papers are in the House of Representatives, and that we can not act upon the matter here until they come over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is quite an important point, and I apprehend, if I understand it, that this is a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Then it would be in the Senate if it originated in the Senate and went to the House of Representatives, was amended there and sent back to the Senate, and the Senate disagreed to the amendment and appointed conferees. So the joint resolution, when disposed of by the conferees, would be reported back to the Senate.

But I want to suggest, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives, as well as the Senate, has jurisdiction over conference committees, and I submit this for the Record in justification of the point which I made, without any desire to be contentious with the Chair about the matter at all, that the Senate of the United States can not recall a measure from a conference committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; that the conference committee must take some action and report it back, as representing both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate has not exclusive jurisdiction over a measure after it goes to a conference committee.

The conference committee can ask to be discharged in the manner in which the Chair suggested a moment ago as being in order; but that is not the case here. The conference committee, representing the Senate and the House of Representatives, have not asked to be discharged. Only the individual members of that committee representing the Senate have asked to be discharged, and it puts the Senate in the position, without the consent of the representatives of the House of Representatives, of going into a conference committee which represents both Houses of Congress and taking a bill or joint resolution away from it before the committee has reported. I say it is out of order, and, it seems to me, it is out of the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that, upon objection, the report must go over; and I make that objection.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before that point is decided I want to say merely one word in reply to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

There was nothing left for the other House to insist upon when the Senate conceded everything that the House had demanded. That is what changed this conference in its character from any other conference. There was no necessity on the part of the House of Representatives to insist upon the conference when the House had been conceded by the Senate conferees all that the House had asked and when they were ready to come to the Senate and ask the Senate to approve a concession to the House of all that the House had asked.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I am now repeating the argument as it was pressed upon me in the conference. I wish to say again that my own preference was to pursue the other course. My own impression was that the desirable course was to submit a conference report, but I yielded to the views of my associates that it was unnecessary, and I still believe it was unnecessary. So far as I am personally concerned, I would just as lief make a formal report, and, if it would save time, I would rather do that. As the Senator from New Hampshire has asked that the matter go over until to-morrow, if the other members of the conference committee are willing to accept the view that I first took upon the subject, I am perfectly willing to proceed in that way, although I am also equally sure that this is a satisfactory mode of handling the subject.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a few words, in view of the fact that there may be some future action taken on the matter. I do not think that this procedure has even the virtue, as suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], of being more direct. I think it is much more complicated, indirect, and involved than the ordinary parliamentary procedure. If we undertake here to act upon this joint resolution after it has been committed to conference, without consulting the House of Representatives or having the sanction of the Representatives of that House, we leave the measure up in the air, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned. We have got to go through the process of notifying them that we have taken this action, and then, instead of the joint resolution becoming a law, the House of Representatives has got to go through the procedure of having the matter explained to them and discharging their conferees on the committee.

Aside, however, from the question of whether it is a more direct or a simpler method of disposing of the business, there is this fundamental consideration, that a parliamentary body must have jurisdiction of a measure before it can act upon it; and when it has disposed of its jurisdiction by submitting it to a joint tribunal of the two Houses of Congress, it can not act upon it until it gets it back again from that joint tribunal.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Georgia will withdraw the papers and also the resolution submitted by him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution goes over under the objection of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], in any event.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It goes over until to-morrow, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has objected to its consideration to-day, and it goes over, as a matter of course, until to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not object if the Senator from Georgia asked to withdraw the papers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will not ask to withdraw them until I have another meeting with those with whom I was acting, who desired the matter to be given this direction. If they themselves are satisfied with the changed course, I shall be perfectly willing then to ask to withdraw the papers.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I shall not ask that they be withdrawn, but I wish to make a brief explanation, after looking at the record of the action taken by the Senate on July 14 in the case of a conference report which I asked to have acted upon. In the case now under consideration the Senate asked for the conference on March 22, and the House granted the conference on March 25. Of course, when the conference report is presented the House should have charge of the papers and first act upon them. In the case of the two bills to which I have referred, namely, Senate bill 35 and Senate bill 36, the Senate asked for the conference. The House, therefore, had the papers in its possession and acted upon the report and the papers had not been delivered to the Senate. Therefore, knowing that the House had acted on the conference report, I moved that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 36) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents, and so forth.

I thought that when the papers came from the House and the Senate had acted the record would be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date; but I am told that the papers did not come from the House on that day. I am quite sure, however, under the rules of the Senate that the Senate, having asked for the conference and the House having granted the conference, the conference report and all papers pertaining to the bill must first go to the House of Representatives for action.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. I understand the conference report goes over, and I therefore ask the Senate to resume the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask the Secretary to read the next amendment proposed by the Committee on Indian Affairs which has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCUMBER in the chair). The Secretary will state the next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs which has been passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is the one passed over at the request of Mr. KENDRICK, to strike out, on page 81, lines 16 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to have the Secretary read the matter proposed to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. On page 81, after line 16, the committee reported an amendment, to strike out:

For continuation of investigations, beginning of construction, and incidental operations on a project for the irrigation of a portion of the conditionally ceded lands of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., \$100,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and to remain available until expended.

Mr. KENDRICK. After the word "expended," in line 22, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 81, line 22, after the word "expended," and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and divided equitably between the Indian land and public and private land irrigated by such project, and that the charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and that the charges as fixed for private and public land irrigated under such project shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of payment of construction and maintenance charges as provided by the reclamation law and amendments thereto.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment—

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not rise to discuss the amendment, but merely to obtain from the Chair some illumination as to the present parliamentary status of the amendment. If I understand the rules correctly, the Senator has the right to perfect

the House text before the vote is taken on the amendment of the committee to strike out. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, the question would be on the adopting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana, would it not, to the text of the House bill? I merely wish to understand the parliamentary status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to the portion proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, this is a tremendously important amendment to the community affected by the irrigation enterprise on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming. It involves an irrigation scheme of wonderful merit, which has been thoroughly examined by experts and is in every sense worthy of the consideration of this body. It is an appropriation of Indian money for the reclamation of Indian lands, and the expense is justified either in times of peace or in times of war.

Mr. President, these lands are at present practically without value merely because they are not irrigated. Their reclamation as provided in this amendment would bring them into the market and make them immediately salable, and would yield to the Indians many times the amount of money here proposed to be expended. It would also greatly enhance the value of the contiguous lands that are now practically unused and yield but little, if any, revenue to the Indians.

Conditions are such in the vicinity of this reservation that the benefits of the expenditure will be immediately manifest. It is not as though by authorizing this appropriation Congress were merely spending \$100,000 on a project that would not be valuable until a million or two were spent. That might be of doubtful value. In this instance, however, the project is of such a character that by the expenditure of a larger or a smaller sum, a larger or a smaller area can be brought under irrigation and made susceptible of cultivation. As a matter of fact, the work which will be done with this money is really the continuation of construction already in progress. An area of approximately 10,000 acres, already irrigated by the settlers in the ceded portion of the reservation, will ultimately become a part of this project, while the Indian Office, cooperating with the settlers, has already spent \$40,000 on a joint ditch. Other ditches are being constructed by the Indian Service in this district and will eventually be united into one large project. In other words, the various units of the whole project are not interdependent, but may be economically constructed separately.

It would be very easy to enlarge upon the wonderful possibilities of this project. The soil is ideally adapted to irrigation. Every tract in the vicinity that has been brought under water has been promptly taken up, and the demand is constantly increasing for this kind of land. Added to this there is an abundance of water, additional quantities of which may be obtained at moderate cost; there is a complete absence of engineering difficulties and complications, while the altitude and climate render successful farming a certainty. Forage crops, grain, and sugar beets may be raised here with splendid results. When the land is reclaimed, much will be added to the wealth of the community and particularly to the wealth of the Indian tribes, whose holdings will be greatly enhanced in value by the beginning of the work.

More than this, Mr. President, not one dollar of this fund will be wasted or misappropriated, but every cent of it will be promptly returned to the Treasury. The construction of the head works made possible by this appropriation will mean the occupation of more tracts by new settlers, the construction of comfortable homes, and the general development of the territory involved in a manner that will aid materially in the solution of the problems of readjustment that will come after the war.

I might say for the information of Senators that the Indian Office only last week recommended, and on last Saturday the Interior Department issued, an order authorizing the immediate expenditure of \$30,000 on ditch construction in the immediate neighborhood of the land the reclamation of which will be initiated by this appropriation. It has been recognized by the Interior Department that early results may be obtained. The settlers are ready and waiting to take up the land just as soon as they are assured that water will be put upon it. Numerous families, I am informed, were awaiting merely the issuance of this order to migrate from Middle Western States into Wyoming and to begin the cultivation of the land upon this project.

The same arguments which induced the Indian Office to recommend this \$30,000 extension apply with equal force to this appropriation. Indeed, the argument in favor of the appropriation is far stronger, for many settlers moved into this section years ago under the impression that this project was

about to be undertaken, and they have been waiting from year to year since for some sign of activity on the part of the Government.

It has been said that the Indian Committee was inclined to eliminate, or at least to reduce, many items in this bill because of the fear that the high cost of material and the difficulty of securing labor would make the expenditures prohibitive. But, Mr. President, if the materials and the labor may be secured at all, almost any appropriation that will contribute toward the increase of food production will be money well spent. We have been told over and over again that food is one of the most essential weapons of the present war. We should therefore hesitate at any form of economy that will tend to prevent the cultivation of wider areas. In the ceded portion of the Wind River Reservation there are thousands of acres which to be made bounteously productive need only irrigation. We have the land, the settlers, and the water. All that is needed is the system to store and distribute the water. With the absence of engineering difficulties, to which I have already alluded, all circumstances point toward economical construction. The project is therefore one in which we may justly look for the largest returns for the smallest outlay.

Whatever motives of economy prompt us in this crisis to reduce to the utmost all expenditures save those designed for war purposes are the very motives which, in my judgment, should prompt us to include this appropriation in the present bill.

Briefly summarized, the appropriation of this sum for the beginning of construction may be asked because of the inherent virtues of the project itself, because it will benefit the Indians whose lands will be improved, because it will be to the advantage of the white settlers who have been expecting action of this kind for the past 10 years, and because it will initiate an irrigation project which at the conclusion of the war will be found an important factor in the readjustments that will have to be made.

I am very much in hope, therefore, that the amendment as offered will prevail.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the proviso reads as follows:

That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and divided equitably between the Indian land and public and private land irrigated by such project, and that the charge as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and that the charges as fixed for private and public land irrigated under such project shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of payment of construction and maintenance charges as provided by the reclamation law and amendments thereto.

I want to ask the Senator when the construction charges for the actual cost of the project are to be made? If made before the project is completed the Senator knows, as we who have been interested in projects in the West know, that the estimates of cost put upon the construction of those projects have never been within 50 per cent of what they have actually cost, and in some cases the cost has been three times or four times the amount of the original estimate. From the Senator's amendment I would conclude that the charge for the actual cost is to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior while the investigation of the construction and incidental operation of the project is under way.

Mr. KENDRICK. No, Mr. President. As I understand it, this amendment will not mean the assessment of the charges before the cost has been determined. I assume that they will be levied when they have been determined, just as is done in other irrigation projects and as provided by the reclamation law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice that the appropriation is—

For continuation of investigations, beginning of construction, and incidental operations on a project for the irrigation of a portion of the conditionally ceded lands of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., \$100,000, to remain available until expended.

That is all that the appropriation is to cover; and then there is added to that a proviso—

That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and divided equitably between the Indian land and public and private land irrigated by such project.

It seems to me that there is no relationship between the two; and I can not tell from this whether the Indians are to pay the actual cost of the project as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior now, or whether they are to pay for it after it is finally determined in the construction of the project.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, my understanding of that matter is perfectly clear—that the Secretary simply acts upon the division between the Indians and the settlers, and the cost is to be the actual cost of construction.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, then, of course, the wording is rather unhappily expressed, because it says:

That the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WARREN. It is to be fixed on the basis of the actual money cost.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it says here "that the construction charge for the actual cost of said project shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. He is to fix the actual cost of the construction.

Mr. WARREN. Well, who would fix it, if not the Secretary?

Mr. SMOOT. That would be determined by the amount of money that was appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. WARREN. Exactly; and that is all this means—that the Secretary shall fix the charges on the basis of the money cost of building it; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. It may mean that, but it certainly does not say that.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Utah I will say that the appropriation, as I understand it, is really asked for by the Reclamation Service, the officials of which report that they can construct the dam and begin, as stated in the language of the amendment, the construction. I will say to the Senator also that because of the simplicity of the engineering problem this project in all probability will be constructed more nearly on the basis of the actual estimate than almost any that have been initiated.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KENDRICK. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. The department asked for an appropriation of \$200,000. It was not proposed for other bills because it was an Indian matter, or partially so; hence the Indian appropriation bill is the proper place for it. The House put in only \$100,000. The investigations of this proposed project have been carried on and perfected as to a large part of it, but it is one of those projects that by adding storage reservoirs on the way the initial project could be extended into very large proportions, and the department wished not only to construct but to carry the investigations somewhat further. The \$200,000 that the department asked for would put in the head gate or diversion matter and bring the water out through the hills to a point where the distribution of water could be commenced. The land is a comparatively level plain from there on, and small ditches could be connected and water utilized, but even this \$100,000 will more than take care of the head gate, and \$200,000 would carry it through to where water could commence to be delivered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, does the Senator contend that the department asked for \$100,000?

Mr. WARREN. I did not say that. I said they asked for \$200,000.

Mr. CURTIS. For this purpose?

Mr. WARREN. It came in the regular way among the estimates for the Reclamation Service. It was not considered by the other committees, because it referred to Indian lands and should go in the Indian bill; and, as I say, the House put in only \$100,000 to commence it. I may say in this connection that, as the Senator knows, every other project that the committee cut down has been left at least a portion of its appropriation, while in this case it is cut out entirely. I think the Senator will admit, as he must, and as must everyone else who knows anything of the situation, that in comparison with other projects there would be no reason, on account of the adaptability or the promise of the project, why this one should be cut out entirely, while all others are given enough to carry them along.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator in reference to the estimate because my recollection is that while the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs was before the committee he did not ask for this appropriation, and the department did not ask that it be put in; and my recollection is that that was one of the reasons why the committee cut out the entire item. If I am wrong, I should like to have the chairman of the committee correct me in that statement. That is only my recollection.

Mr. WARREN. Let me say what my understanding is on that point and not take it from the chairman, of course.

As I said before, an appropriation of \$200,000 was asked for. It was not inserted in other bills because it was an Indian matter. Naturally, the assistant commissioner before the committee would say, if asked that question, probably, that he preferred that it should not go in the Indian bill but that it should go in the other.

This project, in the case of which the amendment of my colleague will perfect the language already in the bill, is

shown to be one of those projects that is part Indian and part for citizens—those, by the way, who have already located there and have been waiting for water for the last 8 or 10 years. The line of ditch goes across the line between the ceded lands of the Indians and the public domain.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question there—not in line with his argument?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to know if the Senator is advised under what act these Indians hold their allotments, and whether it was under the act of 1887 or whether it was a special agreement with them?

Mr. WARREN. I could not tell the dates at present without looking it up; but these lands were ceded to the United States with the understanding that they would be disposed of in certain ways, and that the money from the lands should go back to the Indians. Now, certain portions have been disposed of, and this particular land, although rich in soil if water is put upon it, is barren without it; and unless it is fructified by water the Indians will get a mere bagatelle out of it, whereas with it the land will sell readily at figures that will give them a good return.

I trust that the amendment offered by my colleague will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I believe that completes the committee amendments, with the exception of one committee amendment on page 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 21, after the numerals "\$150,000," the committee proposes to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the sale of anhalonium or peyote to an Indian, or its introduction into the Indian country, shall be, and is hereby, declared to be a violation of the acts of July 23, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 260), and January 30, 1897 (29 Stat. L., p. 506), and punishable in accordance with the penalties provided for therein: Provided further, That possession by a person of intoxicating liquors in the country where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute shall be an offense and punished in accordance with the provisions of the acts of July 23, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 260), and January 30, 1897 (29 Stat. L., p. 506).

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment, and as there are only a few Senators present I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	McNary	Sheppard
Baird	Gore	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Swanson
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nurent	Thompson
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Tillman
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Trammell
Fall	Kendrick	Page	Vardaman
Fletcher	Kenyon	Polindexter	Warren
France	McCumber	Shafroth	Watson

Mr. MYERS. My colleague [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. McKellar, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. CALDER, Mr. KING, Mr. STERLING, Mr. HARDING, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. JONES of Washington obtained the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to make an inquiry. I beg pardon of the Chair, but I did not quite catch what the Chair said on the amendment upon page 81. In other words, if I understood him aright, the question was on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended, and I did not quite catch just what the decision of the Chair was on the viva voce vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The text which was proposed to be stricken out by the committee was perfected by an amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and then the amendment proposed by the committee was disagreed to. So it leaves as a part of the bill the text as it came from the House, with the proviso added on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ASHURST. Then the committee amendment was disagreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

Mr. ASHURST. I take this opportunity to give notice that I shall ask for a separate vote on the amendment of the committee when the bill gets into the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so noted.

Mr. ASHURST. That constitutes all the committee amendments except the one on page 5.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the amendment that has been reached in the pending appropriation bill is a very important one, and I hope that the amendment proposed by the committee will be agreed to. I am not going to discuss that amendment at this time, however; but there are some other matters that I desire to take the time of the Senate upon, and this is as good a time as any to do so.

With reference to the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of wine and beer, a patriotic mother writes me:

Can we feed our soldiers on this poison liquor? No. Can we raise our children on this poison liquor? No. Then, for the sake and safety of this country, do all you can to stop this wastefulness.

A gentleman writes:

I am glad to eat corn bread these days, but it makes my blood boil to think of the efforts of citizens to save while the breweries are permitted to use tremendous quantities of grain and coal and man power in manufacturing stuff that weakens and curses those who use it.

Another loyal citizen says:

Since writing you before, in May of last year, the matter of permitting the brewers to use grain in the manufacture of beer has been placed in the hands of the President, and notwithstanding the fact that the people are placed under all sorts of restrictions, in the use of foodstuffs, he is permitting the brewers to use an amount of grain equal to 70 per cent of the prewar normal. * * * I listened to a man from Puyallup yesterday, talking on the necessity of planting all the available ground, and he said if the war lasted two or three years longer the world would be starving. If there is the remotest possibility of that statement being true, it is time somebody was doing something. * * * From the best information I have been able to obtain there has been used in the last year in the making of booze 7,000,000,000 pounds of foodstuff. Enough to load 87,500 cars of a capacity of 80,000 pounds each, making a string of cars 720 miles long. Just sit down and digest that if you can. What do you think about it? Is it time to call a halt? Surely. * * * The question of food is the most important question before the American people; the President admits that. He is irrationally pleading with the people to produce and save food, and says that if we do not we may lose the war, while he, the self-same man, is handing the self-same food out to a bunch of German brewers to be spoiled and rendered unfit for food.

In my mail this morning I received this from a business man in my State:

In my humble judgment, we are still going at this job—

Referring to the war—

in kid gloves instead of with hard, bare fists. This isn't any pink-tea business, and the sooner we begin to get maximum efficiency the sooner will the war be brought to a righteous end.

There is yet a most powerful enemy stalking through the country—not in Washington State, thank God—more powerful than all the traitors we have harbored or are harboring in our midst—the liquor traffic.

Mrs. Margaret B. Platt, former president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of our State, expresses her feeling in this way:

CONSERVE! CONSERVE!
(Margaret B. Platt.)

Oh, yes; oh, yes;

Dear Uncle Sam,

We women are willing

To help all we can.

We'll eat less bread

And save the wheat.

Add fish to our diet

To save the meat:

We'll use less sugar

And still keep sweet—

And

We'll save our money and buy a bond

For Liberty's cause the world around;

But, Uncle Sam,

Please, won't you close the breweries?

Oh, yes; oh, yes;

We hear the cry

For conservation

We'll do or die—

We'll talk and try,

We'll skimp and save

And work and slave,

Corn bread for every meal we'll eat.

And give our Allies the best of the wheat.

We'll save our money for stamps of Thrift

To give Liberty's cause a hearty lift—

But, Uncle Sam,

We can't understand

Why you don't close the breweries.

Mr. President, every mail brings similar letters to me, together with resolutions from women's clubs, churches, commercial, and

other organizations, urging, asking, and demanding that the use of foodstuffs for the manufacture of beer and wines be stopped during this war. These communications express the view of millions of our best and most patriotic citizens. These words come from hearts torn and bleeding by sacrifices gladly made for their country. These men and women do not understand why grains are not made into food to sustain strength and life instead of being used by the brewer to make beer to undermine strength, becloud the mind, weaken our arms, and threaten our success in this war. They want to win the war. They are willing to make any sacrifice to do it, but they do not understand why food is wasted when the need is so great and they want Congress to act.

The legislative situation, however, is this: A bill—H. R. 4961—was prepared by the administration to conserve food products and introduced in the House June 11, 1917. It must have expressed the views of the President. That bill gave the President full control over the "limitation, regulation, or prohibition of the use of food, food materials, or feeds in the production of alcoholic or nonalcoholic beverages." He could limit or prohibit their use if he saw fit. The President wanted that authority. He sought that responsibility. The House did not think this burden should be placed on him. It was willing to discharge its duty and declare by positive legislative action what it thought should be done. The bill was amended. The President was relieved of this responsibility. The House declared positively—

That no person shall use any foods, food materials, or feeds in the production of alcohol, except for governmental, industrial, scientific, medicinal, or sacramental purposes, or of alcoholic beverages—

and provided severe penalties for the violation of this section. The bill came to the Senate with this provision in it. The Senate committee agreed to it with slight but immaterial changes. The Senate was prepared to adopt it, when the President asked the friends of the provision not to insist upon it and appealed to their patriotism. This request was acceded to, and the Senate simply prohibited the manufacture of distilled liquors. The bill went to conference. A compromise was agreed to, and the bill as it finally passed and became a law declared—

Whenever the President shall find that limitation, regulation, or prohibition of the use of foods, fruits, food materials, or feeds in the production of malt or vinous liquors for beverage purposes or that reduction of the alcoholic content of any such malt or vinous liquor is essential in order to assure an adequate and continuous supply of food or that the national security and defense will be subserved thereby, he is authorized from time to time to prescribe and give popular notice of the extent of the limitation, regulation, prohibition, or reduction so necessitated.

That provision gives to the President unlimited power to do whatever he considers necessary for the national security and defense and is substantially what he asked in the bill as originally introduced. It was a war measure and gives him absolute power over this subject as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If making wine and beer hinders or delays our victory, he ought to know it better than anyone else and ought to stop it. Personally I think it unwise to use our foodstuffs and grains for this purpose. Others think differently. I believe we would add strength to our armies and our industries by stopping the making of wine and beer. Others believe that such action would weaken us more than it would strengthen us. It is asserted that labor will rebel if it can not get its wine and beer. I do not believe it, but I may be mistaken. That it will not do so has been demonstrated in the 27 States that have adopted prohibition. It has not rebelled there, and in those States among the strongest supporters of prohibition are leaders of union labor. If labor did not rebel in peace, surely it would not rebel when its country is at war. No loyal American laborer will relax his efforts for his country because he can not get wine or beer. The sooner the disloyal ones are known, the better, in my judgment. We have been in the war almost a year. The outlook is more terrible and desperate than ever. The President has not yet stopped the making of wine and beer under the power given to him by Congress. He must think it wiser to use our grain and foodstuffs for wine and beer rather than to use them for bread. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. He must believe that the use of grain for beer is better for the national security and defense than to use it for bread. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. He must think that beer and wine do not weaken our industry or endanger the support of our Army. I do, but I may be mistaken. He must deem it better to dishearten and discourage millions of the best and most loyal men and women in the land than to deny wine and beer to some who would put their appetites above their country's weal. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. He may think it wise to accede to the selfish if not unpatriotic ends of the pro-German alliance and brewers' organizations rather than

to the unselfish and patriotic wishes of loyal American citizens. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. He may believe it safer to disregard the views of the temperance people of the country and impose upon them burdens and restrictions in the use of food because he knows their loyalty and patriotism can be depended upon to accept without lessened patriotism whatever is deemed necessary rather than to arouse the disloyalty of those who are not willing to give up their wine and beer for the sake of the country. That may be best, but it is not just. He must deem it more for the national security and defense that food products shall actually rot for lack of transportation to markets rather than stop the use of cars for transporting supplies for the brewer and for carrying their products. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. He may think it better that our schools and churches should close for lack of coal than that the fires should grow dim in the breweries of the land. I do not think so, but I may be wrong. The *Brewers' Journal* of March 1 says that "America is to send them [England and France] 52,000,000 bushels of barley and 13,000,000 bushels of corn, as soon as there are transports available, for that purpose" [the making of beer]; and in the same issue is its London letter, headed "Office of the *Brewers' Journal*, 46 Cannon Street E. C., February 14, 1918," in which it is said "There is great rejoicing among the trade over the order issued by the authorities in Washington that the shipments of American barley and malt to England be largely increased." The President must deem it wisest to allow our grain and our ships to be used for this purpose at this time. I do not think it is, but I may be wrong.

In passing, I want to call the attention of Senators, and I hope these facts may not be overlooked by the President, Secretary of War Baker, and Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo, to the manner in which the makers and users of intoxicating liquors in a crisis like this are escaping many of the real hardships and sacrifices of war.

The men who drink liquor largely are not doing the fighting for the country. They are not physically fit. They are not wanted either in the Army or the Navy. They would be liabilities instead of assets in either. A soldier whose time is spent in either the guardhouse or the hospital is a positive hindrance instead of a help. We are asking for our cleanest and best and most physically fit young men for the Army, and the men who drink liquor therefore largely escape service in the trenches and elsewhere. Nor are they at their best in our shipyards or munitions factories or mines or other industries essential to our success in the war.

The men who spend largely of their means for liquor are not helping to finance the war. It is the frugal and the saving and the industrious who are at work among the masses of the people who are buying liberty bonds and war-saving stamps to furnish the money to win the war.

For the same reason that the masses of drinking men can not buy liberty bonds and war-saving stamps, they do not contribute largely to the Red Cross or the Y. M. C. A. or other laudable movements to relieve the suffering and provide for the comfort and contentment of the men in the service.

These facts show how the loyal, moral, Christian people in the churches and patriotic organizations of the country are bearing not only their own part in helping to prosecute the war, but the part of the slackers whose habits make it impossible for them to do so. The makers and distributors of beer also are quite content to see valuable foodstuffs destroyed in the manufacture of their products if thereby they can increase their output and augment their profits.

It has been suggested to me that the President recognizes that our food situation and that of the allies does not permit of the wastage of any kind of foodstuffs in the production of intoxicating liquors, but that he has felt unwarranted in decreeing prohibition of the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of beers, and so forth, because of the large amount of whisky in bond and stock over the country, and the sale not being nationally prohibited, he may feel that the country might be put on a so-called "whisky basis."

If the President reaches the conclusion that it is not wise or just to let any kind of foodstuffs be destroyed by being made into beer and wine, to me his duty under the authority which he undoubtedly possesses by act of Congress is as clear as noonday. If he then feels that the sale of intoxicating liquors during the period of the war should be prohibited, in order to keep the country from going on a whisky basis, I think I know enough of the temper of the people throughout the Nation and of the Congress itself to say that a word from the President to this effect would result in the passage without delay of any needful legislation to stop the sale of all intoxicating liquor during the war.

Mr. President, I read an article in the Washington Times a few days ago that did my heart good. I hope it is true. It is by a correspondent who gives his name. It recalls to my mind the rather slighting references that were made on the floor of the Senate, when the Army reorganization bill was up, upon the attempts of some of us to prohibit the sale of liquor to soldiers in uniform. I remember some Senators declared that that was an unimportant matter; that it was an insignificant matter; that it ought not to be injected into that measure. In view of what I see in this article, I say it does my heart good to read it, and I am going to read it to the Senate. It is an article by Henry G. Wales, International News Service staff correspondent with the American Army in France, March 20, 1918:

Everyone is on the water wagon at the American front.

Assuming that this article is true, it will bring joy and comfort to thousands of American homes in this land of ours. It will bring joy and comfort to thousands of American mothers in this country who are viewing with greater anxiety the effect influences outside the battle line may have upon their boys than the effect of the bullets.

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 20, 1918.]

EVERYONE AT UNITED STATES FRONT IN FRANCE ON WATER WAGON.
(By Henry G. Wales, International News Service Staff Correspondent.)
WITH THE AMERICAN ARMY IN FRANCE, March 20.

Every one is on the water wagon at the American front. During the past month I have been at the front daily, and often twice in a day, seeing thousands of American soldiers. In that time I saw exactly one man drunk and one other who showed the influence of liquor. The American front is dry not only for the officers but the men of the ranks as well. Nobody comments upon the matter. Nobody apologizes to his guests for the lack of liquid entertainment; in fact, nobody notices it.

I have eaten at various officers' messes where the meals were excellent; better, in fact, than one gets ordinarily in London or Paris, and only mineral water is served.

But when one eats in a dugout with the detonations of shells fired from a near-by battery or the concussions of exploding German shells keeping up a continuous rattle of the chinaware and knives and forks, one's mind doesn't get far enough off the war to ask for liquor. So long as it is absent it is forgotten.

I have eaten with enlisted men often also. Never once did I find one with a bottle or a flask "on his hip." On the contrary, all paid particular attention to the coffee and tea served, drinking so much that it was evident they were entirely satisfied with these beverages.

The little French cafés in the villages occupied by Americans are frequented only by Frenchmen, who occasionally get a bottle of beer and play cards while drinking it. The French can not understand why Americans refuse to take a pull at their "pinard," as they call the red Algerian wine issued to the army.

The doughboys stick to tea and coffee, occasionally making chocolate. The American officers take only light wines when in Paris on leave or official missions. They say that they find it agrees with them better than stronger drinks.

"I'll never buy another bottle of champagne in my life now that I have learned how to order good French wine," said one officer.

Mr. President, we see thousands of American soldiers here in Washington City, probably more here than in any other city in the country. I have observed them carefully. I have watched them closely, and I am proud of them. I am proud of what the American soldier is proving himself to be, and I am glad to send a message to the mothers of this land that the boys they are sending to the front are maintaining the habits here that they did at home. I have not seen yet a single drunken soldier on the streets of Washington. Three or four weeks ago I got on the train at Baltimore, one Sunday evening about 10 o'clock. There were five or six cars practically crowded with American soldiers in their American uniforms. I went through those cars from one end to the other. From the talk I gathered these men had gone on Saturday to New York and Philadelphia and were returning to Camp Meade. There was no loud talk, no swearing, no boisterous conduct, and not a single man who seemed to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor. That, Mr. President, is the record that is being made by the soldiers of the United States as they prepare for this world contest. I am glad that I had some little to do with getting the provision in the Army bill that helps to this, and I am glad to send this message to the mothers of the land.

Mr. President, I would not lessen our power, weaken our Army, or endanger victory in this war to secure prohibition, much as I would like to see prohibition all over this country. We must trust the President to stop the making of beer when he thinks this will do less harm than to make bread. We must rely upon our Commander in Chief to stop the use of grain for beer when it is best for the allies and our armies to use it for bread. He has the power to do so. We have given it to him for the national security and defense. We may doubt his wisdom, but his patriotism is not to be questioned. His devotion to our country and the success of its cause is not to be doubted. He thought he was the best judge as to what was wise in this matter as a war measure. Congress by a majority vote agreed with him. Without at all giving up my personal views I accept the decision thus made. Let us show our patriot-

ism by relying upon our Commander in Chief to exercise the power given him in the wisest and most patriotic way, and trust that he will soon see that the wisest course is that believed in by the great majority of the very best, most enlightened, and most patriotic citizens of our beloved country.

Mr. President, this leads me to state what I have conceived to be my patriotic duty toward legislation in aid of the prosecution of war since war was declared.

There was a time when Americans could honestly and patriotically differ as to what course the United States should follow toward the war in Europe. That time is passed. That war has become an American war. We are in it. It is our war. Every man is for the country or against it. The only way for us to get out of the war is to go through it. We know no end but that of victory, no goal but an honorable and lasting peace. To that end we have dedicated all the wealth, all the resources, and all the manhood of this great Republic. Those whom the people have selected to lead and direct us in this great contest I shall uphold and sustain to the utmost. No partisanship shall control my action nor envenom my words in relation to anything deemed needful for the prosecution of the war, even though I am sure that those in control are playing politics to the limit and the only nonpartisanship they seem to know is Democratic partisanship. If I criticize it shall be to improve and uphold, not to obstruct or tear down. Mistakes will be made, unwise policies pursued, but no word or act of mine shall aid and encourage a foreign foe. Partisan criticism shall be withheld in the face of a foreign enemy and until we can point out mistakes and fix the responsibility for unwise acts and policies in a contest among ourselves to determine what is best for us in both domestic and foreign policies.

In the discharge of my duty as a legislator and representative of the people I shall do my best to perfect legislation and make it subserve the highest interests of our people and make us most efficient in the prosecution of the war. The sole test of proposed legislation for me is and shall be, Will it aid in the successful prosecution of the war? Will it make us stronger and more effective? I have supported and shall continue to support amendments which I deem wise, but when the majority of the Senate has made clear its will as to legislation to aid in carrying on this war it shall have my vote. Its verdict shall be my verdict, and no carping criticism shall fall from my lips. When laws are passed to aid in the prosecution of the war I shall uphold them to the utmost until the need of changes is clearly shown. In taking this position I do not desire by inference or otherwise to be understood as criticizing anyone who may take a different attitude. This is simply my conception of my patriotic duty in this hour of the world's greatest trial and of the supreme test of republican institutions and government, and this shall be my course till this war ends.

We are indeed making an autocrat of the President and an autocracy of the National Government. You can not wage war without it. Autocracy is the essence of militarism; militarism is the essence of war, whether prosecuted by a republic or an empire. We may be carrying it too far, but autocratic direction and control has been Germany's strength and the allies' weakness. I do not fear for our political institutions if we win. I do fear for them if we lose. Liberty and democracy will resume triumphant sway when autocracy has led us to victory against militarism. We make a mistake in assuming that democracy abhors autocracy at all times. On the contrary, it embraces it in war. The fathers of the Republic knew that autocratic power is necessary to a democracy in war. They had just come through a long war. They knew how it must be carried on and they made ample provision for it in the fundamental law of the land, and it became a part of the people's will. Congress can declare war; the President alone can carry it on and end it. When Congress declared war it made this Government a democratic autocracy and the President the greatest and most potential autocrat on earth. He directs our armies and navies at will. Congress has no power to thwart except by negation. It must give support or withhold it. It can not direct or control affirmatively. When war is once declared the President alone can initiate peace. Congress can not do it. The people can not do it, except by revolution. The President alone can give voice to the Nation's will for peace. We must trust him. We must believe in his patriotism. We must confide in his fidelity to the Government and his love for the people. We must uphold his autocratic power in war to preserve our democracy for peace. We must follow him until the people put another in his place, clothed with like power, to lead where his judgment and patriotism may direct until victory rests with our arms and the world is made safe for democracy to live in.

Mr. President, we are engaged in the most terrible and far-reaching war in the world's history. Our part in it will test

our resources and power to the limit. All that we believe to be precious hangs in the balance and depends upon us. Militarism and autocratic government is triumphant in the world unless this offspring of European oppression can save civilization and liberty from its grasp.

In the conduct of this war on our part all great governmental agencies should cooperate fully and wholeheartedly. Congress is ready and anxious to cooperate fully with the Executive. It is composed of men who are as loyal and patriotic as those in executive positions. They will sink individual views, partisan opinions, and personal interests to aid the Executive. Their knowledge, experience, and opinion are at his service. They will gladly give him the legislation needed to do his task. They want to aid him in every way possible. The President should not only welcome but seek their counsel and advice upon the great problems which confront him. He does not do it. I do not say this in any captious spirit. It is the statement of a fact, a most lamentable fact, known to all here and regretted by all. He should realize that in a multitude of counsel there is wisdom, as Congress realizes that in unity there is strength. There are committees in Congress composed of men whose opinions would be of the greatest help to any man, no matter how profound his ability nor how wide his experience. The military committees of the House and Senate could aid by teamwork in smoothing out the difficulties of the Military Establishment and in solving the problems that confront it. The Committees on Foreign Relations could give advice and make suggestions of the greatest value and would be able to save us from many embarrassing situations. Each of these committees is composed of men learned and experienced along their respective lines and actuated by the one desire to aid their country. Such unity of effort would not only aid in a wiser solution of great and important questions but would establish a relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government that would be most beneficial. It would be helpful in the country and inspire the people with confidence in their representatives and make them feel that they are acting solely for the national good. It should be done, but it is not done. The President ought to coordinate himself, and the sooner he does it the sooner will governmental agencies be most effective. And, above all, will there be a feeling of patriotic unity throughout the country that I fear is now lacking but which ought to exist. To do this will not lessen the President's power and prestige, but will strengthen and exalt it and add to the Nation's efficiency.

Mr. President, do we know the largeness of the task before us? Do we measure the gravity of defeat? I fear not. The fight for gain is so fierce that it seems universal. Profiteering is everywhere. It is confined to no class or condition. The Nation's needs are the common prey. Why is this? It is not because we are not patriotic. It is not because we are wholly sordid. We have not come to realize what we must do to win this war. The people do not know the real facts. They will not cease their race for gain and profit till they do know the urgent need for sacrifice and self-denial. They have been told from day to day that things are going all right. They are assured that Germany is on the brink of collapse; that Austria will make a separate peace; that revolution is coming; that the German people are held to their Government only by the strong arm of despotism; and that the people of the central powers are on the verge of starvation. We are told that great armies are being formed, armed, equipped, and trained and that a million and a half men will soon be on the battle front; that submarines are being sunk faster than they are being built, and that this menace is being rapidly overcome; that millions of tons of shipping will soon be launched; and the sky will soon be darkened with aeroplanes. I do not minimize what has been done. We have done much, but it is not so much what we have done as what we must do that concerns me. This we have hardly begun, and this is what the people should be told. This they must know before they will forget self and gain and do what they must do to win this war.

I picked up a paper this morning which was published a short time ago, which contains an article I desire to read, because it simply corroborates what I have just said as to the reports which have been given out to the people. This was evidently an inspired article; it evidently came from information given to the correspondent by heads of departments or members of the administration. Listen:

Many encouraging features of the war situation have developed during the last few weeks. Aircraft construction is going forward satisfactorily—

Yet on yesterday, Mr. President, its progress was developed on the floor of the Senate. Is it possible that it is going forward satisfactorily when it is proceeding so that it looks like we shall get but 37 airplanes to France on the 1st of July? Did

not the administrative officers of this Government know that situation when they gave out the impression that the airplane program is proceeding satisfactorily? If the progress shown yesterday is satisfactory progress, then God help our people—machine-gun construction is ahead of schedule.

We have had information on the floor of the Senate how the machine-gun program is proceeding and how we have delayed and delayed month after month trying to devise a new machine gun, when France had furnished to us full plans of her machine guns, that have proved their effectiveness in this great war, and how we have had finally, after months and months of delay and experimenting, to come back to the French guns.

Transportation of troops is going on with little interruption or loss, and a reorganization of the bureau of the War Department promises increased efficiency.

This correspondent gets the same idea that I have advanced here—and I am going to read what he says—as to the importance of cooperation between Congress and the Executive.

But the most encouraging feature of all is the initiation of a working agreement between the Executive and legislative branches of the Government through the medium of conferences of members of the Military Committees of both Houses of Congress with members of the war council. If this is to be a fixed policy, as intimated, it is certain to result in great benefit to the United States.

I hope that these conferences will not only continue, but I hope that they will be extended until they take place between the Executive of the Government and members of the Military Committees of the two Houses as well as between members of the Military Committees and members of the war council.

"Nothing must be said that will aid and comfort the enemy" has met every suggestion of lack of progress heretofore. The time has come to stop that cry. It is the refuge of the coward and the craven or the shield of the enemy's friend. No greater aid can be given Germany in this dark hour than to lull our people into a false security. We are no craven cowardly people. The bigness of the task does not discourage us. Dangers do not appall nor difficulties dishearten. Let us know what we must do and we will do it bravely, heartily, and well. The way to nerve our people and bring out their greatest effort is to let them know what is needed and what dangers confront them. Christian Science does wonderful things, but it does not make us ready for war. It does not supply the Government needs for a department head to say he is away ahead with his program, when the program is hardly begun. I have sometimes thought that the worse things are the rosier the picture given out. That is not wise. It is time to stop it. Department heads know better, and it is time for them to give the people the truth. If the 22,000 aeroplanes that we were to get to Europe this year will not be more than 300, as has been stated around this Chamber from time to time and if it is not to be more than 37 by the middle of the year, as stated on the floor of this Senate yesterday, tell the people so, and tell them why it is so. If they are to blame for the delay, tell them what to do and they will do it.

If the submarine is sinking the world's shipping faster than ships are being built, let the people know it. If they are to blame for the delay in shipbuilding, tell them how and they will bend every effort to meet this absolute need. If our soldiers and the people of the allied countries are threatened with starvation because we are not saving enough food for them, let the people know it and they will not only hasten and enlarge production but they will deny themselves to the limit. Make them feel that we must win by our own strength rather than through Germany's weakness and the response will be full and prompt. French statesmen do not hesitate to tell the world of their need and their extremity. Every citizen of this country should read the account of the address by the French high commissioner at Baltimore on the evening of March 18. The more we study it the more we feel the heroic suffering of France and begin to know what we must face. The French high commissioner does not hesitate because what he says may reach Germany. He wants to reach us; he must reach us if the French people are to be saved.

FRANCE MUST GET FOOD—TARDIEU PLEADS FOR INCREASED CEREAL SUPPLY FROM UNITED STATES—MANY LONG WITHOUT BREAD—ONLY ONE-THIRD OF INDISPENSABLE SUPPLY SENT OVER IN PAST THREE MONTHS, SAYS COMMISSIONER—HORSES REDUCED 50 PER CENT AND CATTLE SLAUGHTERED.

BALTIMORE, Md., March 26.

America must do more toward reducing the domestic consumption of cereals and increasing exports of that food to France, declared M. Tardieu, French high commissioner to the United States, in an address he delivered here to-night before the Southern Commercial Club.

"You must do it because it is a case of necessity, because it must be done," asserted M. Tardieu. "For these past three months the shipments of cereals from America to Europe have been short of the one-third of the supply recognized as indispensable to strictly compensated needs."

The speaker was given an ovation by the diners, and his remarks concerning the need of food restriction made a profound impression.

BREAD CARD GIVES 10 OUNCES.

Summing up some of the economies of food practice in France, and to emphasize his request for more food from America, M. Tardieu said:

"You are aware that the French nation has always lived mostly on wheat bread. Our prewar consumption was 700,000 tons per month. Our present consumption has been now reduced to 530,000 tons, a reduction of about 25 per cent.

"Of course it was impossible to reduce to any great extent the bread ration of the soldier. That ration, which amounted in the first years of the war to about 25 ounces, has been progressively cut down to a little over 21 ounces.

"But, on the other hand, as regards the civilian population, we had to establish the individual bread card, allowing only about 10 ounces per day, which means barely the third part of the average daily bread consumption of the French peasant or workman before the war.

"Feeding of horses and cattle on cereals which could be used for the making of bread has been prohibited. This resulted in a decrease of 50 per cent in the number of horses in France and in an important reduction of our cattle.

"PROHIBIT ALL PASTRIES."

"We have radically suppressed, on the other hand, all flour-consuming industries. The manufacturing of biscuits and of pastry has been completely prohibited. Strict rules have been imposed on hotels and restaurants, namely, absolute suppression of fancy bread.

"I heard that some Americans, who were in France a few weeks ago, have been wondering why we have not kept the meatless days.

"This suppression of meatless days resulted from the lack of cereals for the cattle feeding, which involved the killing of cattle, and the killing of cattle was meant, on the other hand, to bring about a reduction in the human consumption of these same cereals. I may be allowed to add that of late my good friend, Mr. Hoover, insisted that as far as possible we ought to try to substitute the meat consumption for the consumption of these same cereals.

"We have reduced our sugar consumption by 49 per cent, our rice consumption by 61 per cent, our imports of dried vegetables have been reduced by 52 per cent, of oils and fats by 48 per cent.

"SOME DISTRICTS WITHOUT BREAD."

"The people who have imposed such sacrifices on themselves are a people who have kept fighting for almost four years; a people who have mobilized 7,000,000 men from a population which, excluding the invaded territories, does not exceed 35,000,000 inhabitants; a people whose women and children have taken the burden of industrial and agricultural work left by the men who joined the army; a people whose army lost over a million men in killed, over a million men in maimed; a people whose army, nevertheless, is still holding with an unconquerable steadfastness over two-thirds of the western front.

"Within the last weeks, despite the restrictive measures I have stated, there have been in France agricultural districts which had for days to put up with a complete, absolute deprivation of bread, which could not go on without endangering the physical and moral health of the nation.

"I am aware of what you have done in order to reduce your domestic consumption and to increase your exports; but you must do more. You must do it, for it is a case of necessity. You must do it because it can be done.

"We and our European allies—the British, the Italians—have been taught to suffer. Americans, who are now sharing our burden of blood and of death on the battle line, we are requesting you to share as well in the rear our burden of suffering. In order that you and we win the war, it is necessary that you here in America should all agree to a new effort and to new privations."

The Washington Post, in an editorial on this statement, says:

Whether the enemy is comforted by these facts or not, it is absolutely necessary that the people of the United States should not deceive themselves as to conditions in France. The first step toward giving effective aid is to know that aid is imperatively needed.

That is a truth that should have been uttered long ago and it should be followed by those in authority as to our own conditions.

We must put men on the battle line in western Europe. We must supply them with munitions, food, and clothing, and we must feed the allied nations. We must furnish ships to carry all these things to them and especially to our own armies. No one of these needs can be said to be more important than the other. To fail in one is to fail in all. From the time we entered the war the cry has been "ships, ships, and more ships." The allies have sent that cry across the sea. We have done much to meet it, it is true, but we should have done more and we must do more to win this war. Glowing accounts have been given out of ships built, of contracts let, of armies of workmen enrolled, and of millions of tons to be available, and to make assurance double sure we have been also told that submarine losses are falling off and that this danger is being overcome. What are the facts?

Listen! Oh, that every loyal citizen would listen to these facts and weigh over and over again their significance. In 1915 over 1,800,000 tons of shipping were sunk by the submarine. In 1916 over 3,400,000 tons were destroyed, and in 1917 over 9,100,000 tons fell a prey to this terrible weapon of destruction. In 1915, 685 ships sank beneath the waves, and in 1916, 1,310 disappeared, while in 1917 over 3,000 were the toll of the deadly torpedo. The average for January and February of this year is practically as high as for the preceding January and February.

Mr. President, I have read hastily the address delivered by the chairman of the Shipping Board last night. It is a very interesting address and it gives interesting information; but, Mr. President, I think it falls short of the great duty that rests upon the head of the Shipping Board to tell us not so much how we are progressing but what the enemy is doing to endanger

our success in this war. It is all right to point out in glowing terms the difficulties that the Shipping Board has been confronted with, and what it has accomplished toward solving those difficulties, but it is more important to impress upon the people of this country what we must meet and what we must do in order to get our ships across the sea.

If there is any one impression that a citizen of this country would get from reading that address, to my mind, it is that things are in good shape; that we need not worry; that we are meeting the submarine; but, Mr. President, the fact is that if every ton of shipping that Mr. Hurley says is contracted for was built to-morrow, it would not replace the tonnage sunk last year by the submarine. That is what the people of this country must know; that is what Mr. Hurley and those in authority ought to give to them.

Oh, Mr. President, we need not worry about Germany knowing about this; they have come more nearly giving the facts with reference to the sinking of ships to our people than we have done or the allies have done. Oh, Mr. President, must this democracy in the conduct of this war depend upon autocratic Germany, its enemy, to get the facts with reference to what is being done? Mr. President, why is it that we get news from Germany with reference to our boys at the front before our own people give it to us? Why is it that 48 hours before we knew it from our own sources Germany had told us that American engineers had been captured on the battle line in Europe? Why is it that for 48 hours our officials were giving out to our people that these were Canadians? Why is it, Mr. President, that 48 hours ago Germany told the people of this country that American soldiers had been met in this, the greatest of the world's conflicts, and that they had been driven back; and why is it that for 48 hours our representatives have been telling the people of our country that our men were not on the firing line, and this morning comes the dispatch from Gen. Haig that American troops are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the French and English?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I will ask him if he believes everything he hears reported from German sources?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President; I do not. But when the German reports are verified hours and days afterwards, then it is a strange thing to me that our own people, who control the cable lines and the telegraph lines, do not give us the facts themselves. That is all I am complaining about, that we do not get the facts. I want the people of this country to have the facts. Why? Because I believe it is the best thing; because I believe it will be better for us in carrying on this world contest; I believe it will inspire and nerve the American people to make the sacrifices that are absolutely necessary if we are going to do our part in winning this great struggle. But as to our shipping: With the demands upon it much greater, the world's shipping has diminished, since the war began from twelve to fifteen million tons. What are we doing to offset this terrible destruction? Last year, with nearly 10,000,000 tons sunk, the world built only about 4,000,000 tons.

Senators, I want to impress that fact on you, that with all the progress that we can hope to make in building ships, it will be almost the fall of 1919 before we will be building ships as fast as the submarine is sinking them, if it keeps up its deadly work.

This year the world will not build more than 6,000,000 tons, if it does that; and if the submarine keeps on its deadly work through this year as it did last, we will be short a further 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 tons that are so much needed. Building in English and American shipyards is not progressing and has not progressed as it should. Deliveries are behind the contracts, and if the submarine keeps up its work as heretofore, we can not hope to equal its destruction before the fall of 1919, with the greater part of this year's production not coming available until the last of this year.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has stated that we would probably produce—and I presume he means to include the allies—6,000,000 tons in 1918.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; the tonnage produced by the world—not more than that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, what tonnage is the Senator giving—gross tons?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; dead-weight tons.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator has already stated that the world lost in 1917 nearly 10,000,000 tons.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I referred to dead-weight tons. The tons I am giving are dead-weight tons all the way through.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he is in error.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I venture to say my figures are not too low.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, indeed; they are not; but the Senator has misread the tonnage given by the British Admiralty as dead-weight tonnage, when, as a matter of fact, it is gross tonnage. The gross tonnage sunk since the beginning of the war up to the present time is more than 13,000,000, which amounts to about 16,000,000 dead-weight tons; so that the Senator in giving the probable construction of 1918 in dead-weight tons and comparing it with gross tonnage is making a comparison that is not altogether fair. If he would give it in gross tons, he would find that we will not construct—and when I say "we" I mean this country and our allies—more than 4,000,000 gross tons in 1918, even according to the most roseate estimates that have been made, and not 6,000,000 tons.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am giving my figures in dead-weight tons, and I am taking my figures from statements made by our officials. They may be too low; I am afraid they are; but, as low as they are or as high as they are in some directions, they are bad enough; they make the outlook dark enough and are enough to inspire our people to greater effort. I am inclined to think the figures given by the Senator from North Dakota are nearer the actual facts, nearer the cold truth, but I am trying to be conservative in this matter.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, I take these figures from the British Admiralty figures which were published March 21, 1918, and the British reports are always in gross tons, and it is so stated: The gross tonnage lost in 1914 was 681,363; in 1915, 1,724,720; in 1916, 2,797,866; and in 1917, 8,623,623, making a total of 11,827,572 gross tons, nearly 12,000,000 gross tons; and that multiplied by 1.65 would give you your dead-weight tonnage, which would amount to about fifteen and a half million tons.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; more than 18,000,000 tons.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that is the real loss.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am glad to have those figures given. We will get the truth by-and-by; and the truth, I fear, will be nearer the figures of the Senator from North Dakota than my figures. My figures are, in round numbers, the official figures of the officials of our own Government.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. If the outlook is as bad and black and ominous as the Senator says—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, it is.

Mr. MYERS (continuing). If we are tottering and staggering on the verge of defeat and facing certain defeat, what good is accomplished by proclaiming it and dwelling upon it and spreading such disheartening doctrine to the people of our country?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, this is not disheartening doctrine. This is presenting to the people of this country the facts, and that is what they need. That is what they have not been getting.

Mr. MYERS rose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I can not yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask one more question: What are we to do about it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish the Senator would ask a question relating to the facts. I am simply giving facts. The Senator can draw his own conclusion from the facts. The Senator may not agree with me that it is wise to give these facts to the people. I believe that it is the highest patriotism to do it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what remedy he has to suggest? Criticism accomplishes nothing unless you suggest a remedy.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am going to come right to that in just a few moments.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will just say right here, that one of the best remedies is for the people in authority to tell the people of the country what the condition is, and what they must do and ought to do in order to remedy it, and then the people will do it.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask what the people can do?

Mr. JONES of Washington. If there is anything wrong with labor in our shipyards, let them know what is needed of them,

and they will do it. No man can question the patriotism of the labor of this country. When they know what is required of them in order to win this struggle and save the world from autocracy and militarism you can depend upon them to do that, but as long as you tell them that everything is all right, that things are coming along well, that we are building ships faster than the submarine is destroying them, that everything is doing finely, they will take their days off; they will not work any harder than they feel that it is necessary to work.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask, What can the people do? What is there that they can do?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, it is not so much what the people can do; it is what administrative officers ought to do to let the people know what must be done. When the people know it, then they will do it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They tell them every day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Arizona says that they tell them every day. I have not been able to find it yet, and I read this speech of Mr. Hurley, for whom I have the highest regard and the highest opinion. I believe he is doing splendid work with the shipbuilding program. I have not any criticism to make with reference to that; but I think that if Mr. Hurley would tell the people just exactly what the situation is and what is needed, he would not have any trouble about getting a response from the people of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Did he not do that last night?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; he did not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, let me read to the Senator just a line or two with respect to what was said.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, I have the speech right here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want the Senator to answer the very questions that are propounded here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. All right.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Here is what Mr. Hurley said:

When we took hold we found there was no shipyard in existence with which we could place an order.

Seventy per cent of the space in old yards was taken by the enlarged naval program; the remainder by private concerns.

There were 37 steel shipyards when we began. We have located 81 additional yards, and 18 others are being expanded.

We are building 235 new shipways, or 26 more than exist now in all the shipyards of England.

One concern in Seattle laid the keel of an 8,800-ton vessel, and it was launched in 64 days, and it made a voyage on January 14.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator is going to read all of the speech, I hope he will not do it in my time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Here is just a summary of four or five lines more.

Mr. JONES of Washington. All right.

Mr. SHAFROTH (reading)—

It made a voyage on January 14.

The total of our steel construction on March 1 was 8,265,708 dead-weight tons, of which 3,045,408 were requisitioned.

Of this amount of tonnage, 28 per cent has been completed—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SHAFROTH (continuing)—

This in addition to building our shipyards.

There are 332 wooden shipbuilding ways, which, added to the steel shipways, gives us a total of 739 berths for ships.

Mr. President, when you consider that we had nothing to begin with, that it was difficult to get men, that it was almost impossible to hire men, and is almost impossible yet to hire them, I say the record which has been made by this board is something that it seems to me is unequalled in the shipbuilding history of the entire world.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why, Mr. President, declamation will not win this war.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Well, if it will not, why do we get it from that side of the Chamber?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Declamation will not meet the submarine's ravages. No questions are asked there to answer. That is simply a statement of what has been done. I am not questioning the facts that the Senator has read. I have not impugned them. Confess them all, for the sake of the argument. What impression does that give to the people? The very impression that I think is wrong. It gives to the people the impression that we are getting along all right; that we are able to meet the submarine. You will not find anywhere within the pages of that speech any statement with reference to the losses caused by the submarine; and I said a moment ago that granting the construction of every ton of shipping that Mr. Hurley says we have under contract—over 8,000,000 tons—still the submarines sank last year more than that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How are we going to stop that? The Senator says declamation will not help win the war. If declamation will not help us, why do we have it?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from North Dakota rose first. I will yield to him, and then I will yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask the Senator from Colorado what construction he places upon the words which he read from the speech of Mr. Hurley, quoting him:

The total of our steel construction on March 1 was 8,205,708 deadweight tons.

Does the Senator mean to say that Mr. Hurley intended to convey to the American people the impression that we had actually constructed 8,205,708 tons of shipping?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, Mr. President. It says there exactly what was done.

The total of our steel construction on March 1 was 8,205,708 deadweight tons, of which 3,045,408 was requisitioned.

That is what it means.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, that would leave a balance of 5,160,300 deadweight tons. Does the Senator contend that Mr. Hurley intended to convey to the American people the impression that we had actually constructed, outside of the requisitioned vessels, 5,160,300 tons of shipping?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I do not know what Mr. Hurley understood.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am asking the Senator—

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator asked me what Mr. Hurley understood. I do not know what he understood.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am asking what the Senator understands. What construction does the Senator put upon those words?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I put upon those words the construction that there are now in course of construction, completed in many respects, some of them, and some of them not, 8,205,708 tons of shipping.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, why did not the Senator say that there are contracts out to construct that many ships? The Senator knows as well as I do—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I did not say anything. I simply read the statement that is made here. That is what I have read.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and gave a wrong impression to the Senate. The Senate would draw from that statement the impression that there had been actually constructed that many million tons, when, as a matter of fact, there have been just two ships of less than 20,000 tons constructed and put afloat and in use.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, here is a statement which shows that enormous progress is being made in the line of shipbuilding. I do not care how many ships are being constructed if we are making as much progress as it is possible to make. That is the object and the purpose of this board, and that is what they are endeavoring to do. When a board takes hold of conditions where there are hardly any yards available, where nearly everything is being constructed for private ownership, where everything in the way of construction is occupied and can not be obtained, and yards have to be built, of course, it can not do this in a minute. It is mighty easy for a person by his hindsight to say what should have been done, and if our foresight were as good as our hindsight no doubt some errors would be corrected. But, Mr. President, the test as to whether this Government is doing things well is the test as to how the men are working, and if they are working faithfully and honestly and doing their very best in the matter then they ought to be free from criticism; and the criticism, instead of doing good, will do us harm.

What has England done during this time? What has France done during this time?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, I can not yield for a speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to finish my statement with another quotation from the address that was just quoted by the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will yield to the Senator to do that, because I take it that it is in answer to what the Senator read a moment ago.

Mr. McCUMBER. He also stated:

Of this total steel construction 2,121,568 deadweight tons, or approximately 28 per cent, has been completed.

What do the American people understand from that? I know that Mr. Hurley did not intend to be understood as saying that 28 per cent of this shipping had been completed. What he really intended to say, and what he did say in his explanation thereafter, was that we had progressed to the extent of 28 per cent of what would be required to complete those contracts; but we have not put out a single ship under them, except two ships that have already been set afloat.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. He wanted to ask the Senator from Colorado a question, and I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. KENYON. No, Mr. President. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] asked a question as to what we were doing, or what we could do. I want to bear my testimony to the fact that we are doing tremendous work to end the submarine peril. The American Navy has cooperated with the British Navy, and is sending the submarines to the bottom about as fast as the enemy can make them; and our Navy has done great work.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am agreeably surprised at that contribution to this oratory. It seems to me a little higher and a little more American than this constant criticism.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not permit the Senator from Arizona to question my Americanism in connection with this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not question the Senator's Americanism—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, I do not want any suggestions of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona (continuing). But I question the Americanism of his speech.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is more Americanism in my speech than there is in the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona that the truth be concealed, in my judgment. I may be wrong, and the Senator from Arizona may be right, but he is not any more patriotic than I am.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am more silent in the way of criticism.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Arizona has not any more of a patriotic purpose than I have. The Senator can not find, in the remarks that I have made, any criticism of the Shipping Board, or of the work that it has done. I defy him to find it there.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am not speaking of that, if the Senator pleases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I know it; and the Senator from Washington has not—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Arizona desires to interrupt, he will address the Chair. Then permission will be accorded by the Senator from Washington for any further remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am acquainted with that rule and have never violated it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was laboring under the delusion that it was just violated, but he may have been in error.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have seen the present occupant of the chair do the same thing on the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have studiously and carefully avoided making a criticism against the Shipping Board and its work, but I have stated the facts which I think they ought to state to the American people. I admit that they have done great things. I was going to say it if the Senators had not interrupted me; but what I am calling attention to is the fact that in my judgment the officials of this Government are not giving the facts to the people that would nerve the people and spur them on to do more. I do not say that it is the fault of the Shipping Board that more ships have not been built. I will have my say with reference to the work of the Shipping Board when the time comes for the committee that is investigating it to make its report. I am not criticizing it now.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Just a moment. I am not discussing the great patriotic work of the Navy, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa. He can not surpass me in praise and admiration of it. It can whip its equal of anything afloat that it can get at. Nobody questions the effectiveness of the Navy or its hearty, loyal cooperation with the navies of our allies. But, Mr. President, whether they are sinking the submarines faster than they are being built or not, the fact is that the submarine is sinking the world's shipping almost twice as fast as

it is being built, and it is doing it to-day; and that fact ought to spur the American laborer and the American capitalist and the American people to redouble their efforts, under the control and direction of the Shipping Board, to build more ships, so that as the Navy sinks the submarine the world's shipping may grow and increase to carry our troops.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator has said that he has not offered, nor has he to offer, any criticism of the Shipping Board. I should like to ask him whether it is not a fact that they quarreled for four months, and something over—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not care to go into that at this time.

Mr. WATSON (continuing). Four precious months, as to whether they should build wooden ships or steel ships, and as to whether Gen. Goethals or Mr. Denman should have his way about it, taking almost six months of precious time, with nothing accomplished?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not care to go into that. I did not intend to do anything of that kind in my address. It is not my purpose to criticize the Shipping Board. I have carefully prepared my remarks so as not to do that. I will say here that I believe the Shipping Board is doing its utmost to meet the situation; and if I have any fault to find at this time, it is just what I have said—that they are not telling the American people the real facts and the real conditions and problems that they have got to meet in order to win this war. That was the sole purpose of my address, and I am not going off into these other matters. That applies to all the department and bureau heads as much as to them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. The Senator adverted a moment ago to labor, and stated that—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not going into details about that.

Mr. KING. I was just about to make this observation—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well.

Mr. KING. The Senator indicated that he hoped that labor and capital would do their duty. I was sincerely desirous that the Senator would conjure labor, in view of the fact that we have had nearly 4,000 strikes during the past year, to address itself earnestly to the pressing necessities of the hour.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going into that phase of the matter at this time. Even if I grant—and I simply do it for the sake of the argument—the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, I am satisfied that it will be remedied if the Shipping Board will come to labor and tell labor of the danger that confronts us and of the need for it to put forth every effort—to work overtime in order to meet this danger. Labor will respond when labor knows what is needed and required of it.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted I was just going to say this: I saw my good friend from Minnesota here a moment ago, but he has gone; but I know his intense patriotism, and I was going to say this: I know my loyal, brave, intensely American friend the Senator from Minnesota will not admit that we are not going to curb the submarine. I hope to God we will, but it is not safe to count on that. Let us take the situation at its worst and redouble our efforts to meet it.

Now, I wish my friends would listen to what I intended to say when they got so anxious.

We are doing better. Things are running more smoothly. The investigation that we have conducted has done a great deal of good. It has spurred them to activity, and I think they feel we are trying to help them and not hinder; that we are not captious, but that we are trying to be helpful, and they are showing a desire for cooperation. And, right in that connection, Mr. President, I am going to refer to one or two matters that have been accomplished by this investigation. I know that some of the people in the country criticized Congress for investigating these different things. They say we ought not to be doing it; that it is hampering the Government. I venture to say that there is not a Senator on any committee that has been conducting any of these investigations that will not admit that every one of them has done great good and has made the Government stronger and more efficient to-day than it was when these investigations began.

Just as an illustration, contracts have been let much more promptly since this investigation began than they were before. There were applications pending from my State for contracts for the building of wooden ships, and this I know about personally. They were not acted upon. They had been before the Shipping Board a long time, with no action taken. I do not blame anybody; I am simply calling attention to the fact.

When this investigation was started and these matters were called to my attention I asked Mr. Hurley about them before the committee, and within two days I had an answer, stating that these contracts would be let. That was well, and other contracts have been acted on in the same way. I do not say that Mr. Hurley was to blame for the delay in connection with those contracts. Mr. Hurley was comparatively new at this work. I do not say that anybody especially was to blame, because these contracts had not been acted upon; the board has had a tremendous job to do. It is a fact, however, that they had not been acted upon, and it is a fact that they were acted upon promptly when the matter was called to their attention before the committee.

Again, Mr. President, what is the situation about contracts for wooden ships? We have been urging their construction. We need every ship that we can build. Mr. Hurley says that in his statement given to the committee. He says they are going to get every ship that can be built—steel and wood. We have the timber and the wood on the Pacific coast, but what is the report now? The report is that no more contracts for wooden ships will be let that involve the construction of new ways. There are shipbuilding companies on Puget Sound that are building ships for the Government that are doing the work satisfactorily. One company says, "If you will let us have the contracts, we will build five additional ways and put in the water 10 more ships this year," but they will not let the contracts. Why? It was stated a few days ago by a high official of the Shipping Board that they would not let these contracts because they did not know whether or not they would have engines to put in the ships when they are built.

My God, Mr. President! Is it possible that the people of this country can not build engines and machinery as fast as they can build ships? If that is the case, then we are in a bad way; but I do not believe that that is correct. I believe that we can marshal the laborers and the mechanics of this country, organize and mobilize our power and our skill and our labor to man every ship that is built and to build many more ships.

What do my people say? They say that if the Shipping Board will determine upon a definite program of building ships Oregon and Washington can furnish the lumber and the labor for 450 wooden ships every year, and they can do it. There is no doubt about it. I hope the board will soon adopt such a program. No one will criticize them for taking any reasonable risk in making contracts for ships in this hour of the Nation's need, but they will be criticized if they don't get the ships they could get.

We have done great things in the shipbuilding development. We have not done the best we could. When I say that I do not say it in criticism of the Shipping Board. It is more in criticism of the people of the country who have not responded to our needs as they should, because they did not know them.

We have not done the best we could, but grant that we have done much the needs are greater now than ever before. Our own needs are greater, the needs of the allies are greater. We need more patriotic and unselfish "know how," we need more energetic, faithful work, more earnest, faithful, patriotic workers, looking only to the performance of their task and a victory for our cause and country. Let those in charge of the work and who know the details and the needs tell the people frankly what is lacking or what is needed in the shipbuilding plants, in the engine-producing plants, and elsewhere and our people will do it. Trust the people. Have confidence in them. They will overlook mistakes honestly made.

I want to say to the Senator from Colorado there are mistakes, mistakes in action, mistakes in policy that I know are honestly and patriotically made, and I will never criticize them except to help correct them. The people will withhold harsh criticism in this hour of stress, but they will not condone hurtful and timorous concealment of real needs. They will not take boasting or self-glorification for genuine performance. Let department heads stop telling of what they think they are doing and do what ought to be done. The people will find out and give due credit for whatever may be accomplished.

Not only are we not building ships fast enough but we are not able to equip them as fast as we could build them. Not only is the present supply of foodstuffs very low but the pros-

pects for the future are dark and full of danger to us and the allies. We are failing in aeroplanes. Steel is slow in delivery. Engines and machinery are lacking. We must follow Germany's course and coordinate our industries to one end and aim—the prosecution of this war. We have the man power, if properly directed and used, to meet all these needs.

Now, let me tell the Senator from Colorado what I would do if we keep falling behind, if we do not come up with ships, machinery, food, fuel, and munitions. If this man power will not apply itself it should be applied by the Government. We have taken the flower of the land to fight and to die. If those at home will not work and sacrifice to support them they will have to be made to do so. It may not be opportune, we may not be ready for it, but I would vote to-morrow to take every man and woman in this country between the ages of 18 and 60 years and assign them to that work where they are most needed, regardless of what they are now doing.

That is no proposal to conscript labor. I would not conscript labor as such. If we are to have conscription outside of the Army it must be the conscription of every man and every woman, no matter what their occupation or work may be, without fear or favor. This ought not to be necessary. It may not be necessary if the people can realize what must be done. Oh, that some tongue of fire could arouse them to the needs of the hour. I wish the President of the United States would come to us not to interpret the thought of the people but to tell them the needs of the hour and point out our duty to the boys at the front and to the Nation. What he would say the papers would print, the people would read, and the response would be prompt and full.

Not only should we know the facts at home but we must not minimize the situation abroad.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Let us weigh these facts carefully to determine what is necessary. Germany is in a better position to-day than ever. She has conquered Russia and Roumania and forced from them a humiliating peace. Her eastern armies are free to act to the south or on the west as they see fit. They can strike when and where they will. Oil and minerals will soon be available to them in abundance. Within six months the menace of starvation will be over. The granaries of eastern Europe will be open to her without fear of interruption. They feel that they are victorious. This is the critical time for us and the allies. If we can win the war this year it will save us years of war, billions of money, and thousands of lives. If this war is won for us, we must win it, and we must do it before the allies are defeated. I am no military genius, but unless we exert our utmost power I see the possibility that the Salonikan army may be destroyed; Italy may be overwhelmed; France, brave and glorious France, may be brought to her knees; England, proud and tenacious, may be compelled to accept peace; and our brave boys may be confronted 3,000 miles from their base of supplies by the conqueror of Europe.

Then we will wake up, but it will be too late. Our Army will be lost. The peace imposed upon us will dim the glories of the past and be a perpetual humiliation for the future, all because we have failed to do our duty. What shame, humiliation, sorrow, and regret will go with us to our dying day if our boys come home defeated and disgraced and point their fingers at us and say: "We did our best but we failed. We were defeated because you failed to keep us supplied with what we needed to bring victory." Then indeed will we call upon the hills and mountains to fall upon us. Then indeed will we wish that we had never been born.

This possibility emphasizes to me what we are fighting for and what the issue is that demands the sacrifice of so much wealth and noble manhood upon a foreign soil. We did not go into this war in the interest of the world. We did not go into it in the interest of Europe. We did not go into it to restore ancient boundaries nor to avenge the wrongs of foreign peoples. We went into this war for America. We went into it for the United States. We went into it for our own people. We went into this war to defend and maintain the rights of American citizens, to uphold the Nation's sovereignty, and to deserve the respect of the peoples of the earth. All these things are at stake now, and more. The very essence of our national life is in danger. The Pilgrim Fathers braved unknown dangers and death for the right to live the life they wanted to live. The priceless right to live and be governed in their own way carried Washington and his devoted band through the sufferings of Valley Forge to the glorious victory at Yorktown, and burst in full fruition at Gettysburg and Appomattox. We are threatened with the loss of that priceless heritage. The right to live our own national life in our own way is the issue at stake on the western battle line in Europe. It is more precious to us now than it was in the past, because it is enriched by the sacrifices, courage, and blood of those whose fame will never

die. That right will be preserved. It must be preserved. Our people will preserve it no matter what the cost may be, and in preserving it for ourselves we will preserve it for a liberty-seeking world and the humanity of all time.

Mr. President, this is what our boys are fighting and dying for. May we nerve and cheer them by showing to them that the soul of this people is aroused; that we will make any sacrifice; that we will endure any privation; that we will forget self and forego gain; and that every resource and every ounce of the Nation's power is behind them until victory crowns their efforts, ennobles their sacrifices, and rewards their valor. Let the German people know that we hold them our enemies so long as they sustain and uphold a system that would impose upon us the burdens, the dangers, the brutality, and autocracy of militarism, and that we will wage this war with all our energy, with all our resources, with all our manhood, and with all our power until we are safe and secure from the dangers of that awful curse to freedom, liberty, and individual happiness and national life.

Mr. President, we have put our hand to the plow; we must go to the end of the furrow. If militarism is not destroyed abroad it will be enthroned at home. The issue is worth all the cost. Every resource and activity of our people must be directed to the production of food, fuel, clothing, guns, ammunition, war equipment, aeroplanes, naval vessels, railroad transportation, and ships, manned and equipped. The one supreme thought, purpose, and aim must be to wage this war. Let capital give up its gain and labor forego its reward. Let self be forgotten and personal ends forsaken until we are forever free from the danger and threat from within or without of militarism.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I should like to have the Secretary report the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANCE in the chair). It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, under the heading "Suppressing liquor traffic," the House text reads:

SUPPRESSING LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, \$150,000.

At this point in the bill the committee proposes to insert the following:

Provided, That the sale of anhalonium or peyote to an Indian, or its introduction into the Indian country, shall be, and is hereby, declared to be a violation of the acts of July 23, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 260), and January 30, 1897 (29 Stat. L., p. 506), and punishable in accordance with the penalties provided for therein.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question for information? I anticipate a point of order against the amendment; in fact, three or four Senators have told me that they are going to make a point of order on this particular provision. I have been looking over the matter during the last hour, and I fear it is subject to a point of order. A point of order is not debatable. I ask permission, therefore, to include in the RECORD certain matter found at the bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8 of the committee's report, and also a letter from Dr. Wiley and some of the testimony from the Smithsonian Institution in reference to the drug called peyote. I ask that permission because I could not ask it after the point of order is made, as it would not be debatable.

Mr. OWEN. I now make my point of order and submit for the RECORD the following letter in justification of it.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me ask the Senator, Is the letter a petition of the Osage Tribe?

Mr. OWEN. No; it is from the Arapahoe, Cheyenne, Kiowa, and Comanche Tribes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Arizona submitted a mass of material that I think he ought to have summarized and told those of us who know very little about this matter exactly what the argument on that side has been. The Senator from Oklahoma offers a paper. I ask that that paper be read, whatever it may be.

Mr. OWEN. I shall be pleased to have it read. It is a letter from these Indians asking that this legislation be not passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 23, 1918.

To the Hon. ROBERT L. OWEN,

United States Senate:

The undersigned delegates, representing the Arapahoe, Cheyenne, Kiowa, and Comanche Tribes of Indians in the State of Oklahoma, hereby respectfully present to you, and through you to the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, Senators and Representatives, their petition requesting the Oklahoma delegation to regard the wishes of our tribes in the matter of pending legislation on the use of peyote.

The people of our respective tribes believe that the use of peyote is not only harmless but that it is positively beneficial to us, and that the prohibition of its use by Congress would be a sad misfortune to our people.

Therefore we ask that when the bill relating to this subject is brought up for consideration in the Senate and in the House of Representatives the wishes of our tribes will be given due consideration by you, and that, if consistent with your judgment, the pending bill be opposed.

Very respectfully,

JOCK BULL BEAR,
CLEAVER WARDEN,
PAUL BOYNTON,
Arapahoe Delegates.

REUBEN TAYLOR,
JOE WILLIAMS,
CHIEF LITTLE HAND (his X mark),
JOS. MIGUEL,
Cheyenne Delegates.

J. W. WALDO,
CHARLEY JACKSON (his X mark),
KIOWA CHARLEY (his X mark),
Kiowa Delegates.

WILBUR PEAWO,
Comanche Delegate.

Mr. ASHURST. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma to withhold the point of order just long enough to have read a letter from Dr. Wiley on this subject. It is a very short letter, and I ask that it be read.

Mr. OWEN. I withhold the point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the letter sent to the desk by the Senator from Arizona.

The Secretary read as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1918.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have just been called on the phone and told that a hearing is to be held before your committee this afternoon on the subject of peyote or mescal button.

I made some investigations of this deadly drug a few years ago by administering it to one of my assistants, Mr. E. E. Ewell, who consented to make the trial. Mr. Ewell is now dead, so could not be called as a witness.

I am suffering from a very severe cold and can not appear before your committee in person. I desire, however, to make an earnest plea to your committee to prohibit the use of this insidious drug among the American Indians. It is driving many of them to ruin. Its effects may be compared in some particulars to those of cocaine. It causes the victim, who becomes semiconscious, to have the most wonderful sensations of delight and pleasure, especially through the visions of flowers, sunshine, and verdure, which rise before him. The intoxication lasts from 24 to 48 hours and then gradually passes away. During its continuation the person is totally unfit for any useful purpose. It is a typically habit-forming drug, and to those who indulge in it the desire for its use becomes uncontrollable. The active principle is probably a resin or a glucoside. It probably is of the same nature of the poison in Indian hemp. Its use can no more be regarded in the light of a religious rite than that of alcohol, morphine, or cocaine. Its entire prohibition would conserve the financial, physical, mental, and spiritual welfare of the Indians.

I ask you to read this letter to your committee and to have it appear in its proceedings.

Respectfully,

H. W. WILEY.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. ASHURST. I send to the desk and ask, without reading, that the report of the committee on this subject, found at the bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8, be included in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arizona is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SUPPRESSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC (GRATUITY).

Estimate, \$150,000, and allowed by House and the committee. Two amendments have been added to the House provision, one prohibiting the sale of "peyote" to an Indian, or its introduction into Indian country, and the other making possession by a person of intoxicating liquors in the Indian country, where prohibited by treaty or Federal statute, an offense.

Respecting "peyote" or anhalonium, some of the Indians seem to regard the use of this herb or plant as sedative and not harmful and others object to its prohibition upon the ground that it is used by the Indian as a part of his religious ceremonies. The weight of the testimony heard before your committee seems to justify its exclusion from the Indian reservations, because its effect is harmful. It appears to be a dried bean, round in shape, and is smoked, eaten, or taken as a potion when made into a liquor or tea. Some written objections to this provision prohibiting its use appear in the record of the committee hearings. Several briefs and arguments against the use of the drug and justifying the amendment are incorporated in the committee's hearings. In the Indian appropriation act approved May 18, 1916, Congress provided that—

"The possession by a person of intoxicating liquors in the country where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute shall be prima facie evidence of unlawful introduction."

This legislation has helped very much in this important work, but we are often confronted in the prosecution of these cases with the defense that the liquor was found or purchased from some one within such territory, and therefore no action can be taken because the real offender is not known. This plea is oftentimes without foundation, but it is impossible to rebut same. It therefore becomes necessary to make more stringent the law on this subject.

The Indians in Oklahoma, and especially at Osage, have considerable funds, and because of their wealth and the valuable oil and gas lands it becomes necessary to protect them to the fullest extent against intoxicating liquors. Intoxicants are often used for the purpose of debauching the Indian and to procure his signature to a lease or deed of or to valuable land. With legislation indicated making it an offense to have liquor in possession within the Indian country, this traffic would be reduced to a minimum and it would afford greater protection to the Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the point of order presented for the determination of the Chair?

Mr. SHAFROTH obtained the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I am willing to leave the point of order to the determination of the Chair. If the Senator from Colorado will pardon me, as he has been recognized, the question whether the sale to Indians or the introduction into Indian country of a certain substance called peyote should be prohibited is one that has been before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs a number of years. In this bill the Senate committee, after voluminous hearings, included a provision that this drug, sometimes called peyote, or anhalonium, should not be imported into Indian "country."

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me for a moment?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not the floor; I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Colorado. I will yield if I can do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The question I wanted to propound is this: We are trying to conserve the health and the lives of the Indians. It is a phrase that is frequently used, that they are the wards of the Nation. Am I correctly informed when I am told that this particular drug is so intoxicating that it inflames the brains of the Indians and is even worse than whisky, for instance?

Mr. ASHURST. The testimony shows that this drug is sometimes eaten like dry tobacco. Peyote grows on a small cactus plant. It is eaten or it may be brewed into a tea and drunk as a potion. The point of difference, or the line of cleavage, as to prohibiting its use arises in this way: Most of the Indians that use it, as far as I am able to learn, use it in the nature of a sacrament at some of their religious ceremonies. It is not used as is tobacco; it is not used as is alcoholic liquor by the American people; but it seems to be used by the Indians as a sort of sacrament in some religious function, some religious rite.

The testimony seems to be conclusive that the drug, when drunk as a potion or when taken in the dry leaf or button, produces a most agreeable and felicitous state of feeling, a rapturous delight on the part of the one who takes it; that is to say, to a person filled with peyote a cloud that in fact was dark would turn into a rosy sunset of pastelle shades, and a mountain of insignificant proportions would become one of gigantic proportions and of symmetrical outline. In other words, peyote produces an exhilaration of imagination, followed by a nervous reaction that sinks the patient into sullen gloom.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator know whether or not they use it at the snake dances?

Mr. ASHURST. No; I am not aware that it is used at the snake dance, unless it be that it is made into a potion and drunk at or during that ceremony.

Your committee took the view that the use of this drug should not be allowed if possible to prevent it. Your committee took the view that this drug should not be allowed to be imported into the Indian country. Your committee felt that the sale of peyote to Indians should be prohibited. In my judgment, from a practical standpoint, it is almost impossible to prevent the Indians from using it, because it grows on our side of the Rio Grande and we can not prevent the Indian from gathering it. He knows where it grows, and how you can prevent him from secretly gathering, drying, and using it I do not know.

Our amendment does not penalize an Indian for gathering and using it. It simply penalizes the sale of peyote to the Indians or the importation of it into the Indian country.

Mr. OWEN. At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Colorado I shall renew the point of order on parliamentary grounds, not on the grounds of health or other consideration.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have been astonished at the course of the discussion in this Chamber during the proceedings of yesterday and to-day. I must say that I do not like the criticisms that have been made, because I think they are unfair. I do not think they are made in the spirit which should animate a Senator of the United States in this crisis. It seems to me these attacks are prompted by passion little short of madness.

Mr. President, it must be remembered that the United States was not a warlike Nation at the beginning of this war. We had lived in peace. Our people were opposed to enormous armies. Ever since the Civil War there had been a continued policy to hold the size of our Army down to the minimum and to prevent

every effort to enlarge it. We did not at that time realize that any nation would willfully disregard our rights on the high seas or ever attempt to destroy those rights. We believed nations were honest in their intentions and in their purposes, and, consequently, when this war came upon us we were not prepared. We could not have been prepared except through action of Congress in the various matters of legislation that were necessary to change our settled policy years in advance of the time of present need.

When on the 6th of April, 1917, we declared a state of war existed between the United States and Germany there was begun the most tremendous task of equipping our Army and Navy, and in every way making ready for this great struggle. Contracts of hitherto unimagined dimensions, involving expenditure of most stupendous amounts, were made. Because the terms of some of those contracts have not completely been carried out are our officers to be held up to ridicule and scorn? Is it possible that men will not recognize that it is only elementary justice to accord commendation and encouragement to officers who are giving the very best that is in them, and that to withhold condemnation is a duty?

A great uproar has been voiced over the delay in aeroplane construction. It was repeated yesterday time and again that about 20,000 aeroplanes, or a very large number, were to be finished by the 1st day of July of this year, but that their completion had been delayed 90 days. Senators have had experience with contracts, they have had experience in building, and they know it is most difficult ever to get a contract performed in the time that the agreement prescribes.

Is it to be contended that because a contractor can not comply with his covenant the officer of the Government who is straining every nerve to complete the war equipment must be blamed for it? What is there fair in a contention of that kind, and what result does it bring? What is the remedy proposed? There is no remedy proposed. The officers are doing the very best they can, and when they are doing that we should commend them.

Mr. President, we know that the steel plants at the beginning of the war were crowded with orders. We know that minerals even could not be found that were necessary to go into the construction of the metal parts of aeroplanes. We know that the wood for the frames was still growing in the virgin forests. When contractors undertook to manufacture this large number by the 1st of July the only expectation that could reasonably be entertained was that they would use every effort and every endeavor to accomplish that result. It is said that in order to get the proper timber in sufficient quantity for the aeroplanes and ships it was necessary to build railroads to the forests to cut the timber, after which it had to be seasoned and prepared for use.

Is it to be the rule that where the contractor failed or where delay was encountered in procuring material that officers are to be held up to scorn? What is the object of criticism of that kind? It is that those in authority must be removed. That is the only logical conclusion to be deduced.

Those who know Secretary Baker know that he is an incessant worker; they know that he works day and night upon the problems constantly arising and pressing upon him for solution. Mr. President, we know that at night in the War Department there are hundreds of persons diligently working to hasten these contracts and to carry forward the multifarious undertakings designed to furnish our Nation with a proper military equipment. It is but just and proper that we show consideration for the official who refuses to be swept off his feet and demand time when it is available before rendering a weighty decision.

Suppose it is decided to build wooden ships. Instantly there is criticism. It is declared to be an economic waste to build wooden ships when steel ships are the only ones which should be constructed. When the question arises as to whether a certain type of ship should be built and an interval is taken for consideration, even though the delay is not serious nor the question clear, and the net result means the difference of only 15 or 20 days, it is complained that the decision should be entered in a moment. Are we to condemn an official in such a case as that?

Mr. President, we find that when some contracts were awarded there was a great protest about their being let at too high a price. Yet there would have been greater criticism if the usual time of advertisement for bids had been given than that insufficient time was not given for bids. Any number of such objections may be made. The only thing that we can say with fairness is that the officers have done what seemed to them best. They exercised their best judgment.

Suppose you were to remove Secretary Baker; is it possible that you could put a new man in that position who would be

as well qualified as is he? There has been criticism about military men letting contracts of this kind when they have not had proper experience and are not skilled in business affairs.

Mr. President, some people objected very strenuously to military men doing this work, and made a demand for business men of large experience. We created various boards with civilian membership, and they were criticized.

Then there was criticism to the effect that perhaps the best man was not selected as Secretary of War. Mr. President, if you were to select a new Secretary of War to-day, have you any assurance that the man you select would be any better than the present Secretary of War? The testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs shows that a wonderful amount of work has been done by Secretary Baker, and he deserves the highest praise and commendation.

Six or eight months ago there was a campaign of abuse against the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels. Yes; he was held up to scorn and ridicule; but, Mr. President, no voice of criticism is raised against him now. Everybody concedes that he is making one of the best, if not the very best, Secretaries of the Navy who has ever filled that high and important office.

Suppose you turn out one official and appoint another, are you going to better conditions? Is it not true that in such a case you would be removing a man who has had experience, which is most valuable, and substituting one without such experience? Is not it still true that it is unwise to swap horses in the middle of a stream?

Mr. President, take the question of shipping: I want to repeat and read what I read before; I think it is a marvelous statement, proving the speed and the effectiveness of the Shipping Board in its vital task of ship construction.

The statement is:

The total amount of our steel construction on March 1 was 8,205,708 dead-weight tons. This is made up of 5,160,300 dead-weight tons under contract with the Emergency Fleet Corporation and 3,045,408 dead-weight tons of requisition vessels.

Of this amount of tonnage 28 per cent has been completed.

Mr. President, what does that mean? It means an enormous amount of tonnage has been completed, according to the statement of the chairman of the Shipping Board. He says here in the text of his speech:

Of this total steel construction 2,121,568 dead-weight tons, or approximately 28 per cent, have been completed.

That is the amount.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. What does the chairman of the Shipping Board mean by "have been completed"—that the steel has been completed?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suppose it means what it says—completed.

Mr. GALLINGER. The ships are not completed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; that is as I understand it; that is what he says.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, well.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know. These are the people who, as a matter of fact, know what they are doing when they say that it has been completed. I do not know why—

Mr. GALLINGER. But he was talking about steel.

Mr. SHAFROTH. About what?

Mr. GALLINGER. He was talking about steel, not steel ships.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No. The statement is:

The total amount of our steel construction on March 1 was 8,205,708 dead-weight tons. This is made up of 5,160,300 dead-weight tons under contract with the Emergency Fleet Corporation and 3,045,408 dead-weight tons of requisition vessels.

Of this total steel construction 2,121,568 dead-weight tons, or approximately 28 per cent, has been completed. That means that in addition to the building of our new yards, we have also been building ships; that is, the program for steel ships has advanced 28 per cent toward completion.

I want the whole truth to be known. I have not read this entire speech as yet, but I have read the synopsis of it. How can you build completed ships inside of six or eight or nine months?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—I am not going to get into a controversy over that—the Senator led us to believe, or at least intended to lead us to believe—

Mr. SHAFROTH. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think he believed himself that 28 per cent of the ships have been built. If we go up one of the streets of Washington where they are constructing a great office building, we may find the steel construction up, but 10-

body would think of occupying that building, although the steel work has been completed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have not read this entire statement; it was handed to me while the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] was speaking, and I did not have time to read the text of the speech, but there was a synopsis of it here, which would seem to show great activity, and it is not open to the construction which the Senator from New Hampshire places upon it. The statement is that 28 per cent of the steel construction—put it in that way; I care not what it is—has been completed. That shows activity; it shows that there has been as much work done as could possibly be done. For that reason this should not be the subject of criticism.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator from Colorado has gotten a misunderstanding of that, judging from his discussion with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I think Mr. Hurley makes the matter very clear. After making the statement that "2,121,568 dead-weight tons, or approximately 28 per cent, had been completed," he then states:

That is, the program for steel ships has advanced 28 per cent toward completion.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. That does not mean that he has completed a single ship.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, the ships are in various stages of construction; there is no doubt about that; they are not all in the same stage of construction.

Mr. McCUMBER. It simply means that, taking the entire contract, they have completed about 28 per cent of it in actual work. That does not mean that a single ship is afloat.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be; but, Mr. President, there can be no doubt that that exhibits great activity; that it demonstrates the fact that there has been energy and activity displayed which is remarkable, indeed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the future will show greater activity than has been shown in the past, because, if it has taken over a year to arrive at the point where 28 per cent of the program has been completed, then before the program is completed it will take, at the same rate, nearly four years; and I am quite sure, if the Senator from Colorado will think the matter over, he will ask that greater activity be shown in the future than has been shown in the past.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Of course, we want these ships constructed as rapidly as possible, but it requires time to get ready to build them. Mr. President, look at this statement in regard to the condition which confronted the Shipping Board at the start. The statement is:

Seventy per cent of the space in old yards was taken by the enlarged naval program, the remainder by private concerns.

So when the Shipping Board began its operations there were no slips upon which could be built either wooden ships or steel ships. Is it expected ships will rise as if by the touch of the lamp of Aladdin? You can not build ships in that way. You have got to take time to prepare the ways, and you have to take time to get the steel. The steel plants were busy; they had orders months ahead and could not take these contracts and manufacture and fabricate the materials into the proper shapes in a month's time. Mr. President, this statement says:

There were 37 steel-ship yards when we began. We have located 81 additional yards, and 18 others are being expanded.

Mr. President, what more can be asked? Congress is ready to appropriate all the money that is necessary to win this war. There is no doubt that these men are anxious and ready to put these ships in commission and to get them over where they can be an effective force.

Mr. President, in the construction of ships great difficulties have been encountered. For a long while sufficient men could not be obtained. Are the members of the Shipping Board to be criticized because men will not work? Again, the employees of the shipyards at times went on strikes. Are the members of the Shipping Board to be criticized because some of the workmen engaged in the construction of ships quit their jobs? Is there any fairness in making a charge of that kind?

Mr. President, it seems to me that when we take into consideration the fact that we were unprepared—the fault of Congress and not the Shipping Board—and that when they took up their task the conditions were deplorable, the Shipping Board should

be criticized or commended according to the conditions as they found them and according to how they have improved the opportunities that have been given them.

There has been a demand for a great Army. I have heard criticisms made as to the manner of raising the Army. Some have said that the men were called out too quickly before the ships were ready to transport the troops oversea. Others have complained bitterly that we have not a large force in France. Others have said that they were organized before we had guns ready to place in their hands. Others have uttered criticism because the bore of the Springfield rifle was changed and modified so as to accommodate ammunition made and used in Europe. Others have stated that we ought to have adhered to the old bore of the Springfield rifle and continued to grind out the rifle which we were prepared to manufacture.

Why, Mr. President, no matter which side of any proposition was presented, it has been made the subject of criticism; but it is not fair; it is not right, when men are doing their best, that they should be subjected to criticism because of conditions over which they have no control. If any officer, agent, or employee of the Government has willfully done something wrong, then, of course, there should be criticism, and there should be removal.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. I desire to understand, if I can, the Senator's position with reference to this matter. It seems that he is expressing his opinion, and, I judge, that of others. Does the Senator take the position in a republic, a democracy, where the business is purely the people's business, that, right or wrong, there shall be no criticism of the acts of public officers, although they may, in the judgment even of the Senator himself, tend toward public disaster?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not take that position. There is such a thing as fair criticism and such a thing as unfair criticism, in my opinion.

Mr. FALL. Undoubtedly; I thoroughly agree with the Senator as to that; but I understood the Senator to say that, unless it was apparent that some public official was willfully pursuing a wrong course, he should not be criticized. Why, Mr. President, in my judgment—

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I did not go to that extent.

Mr. FALL. I was simply going to say that, in my judgment, in the office of the Secretary of War or in any other great department of the Government from this Chamber to the White House, ignorance is more to be condemned than willful intent.

Mr. SHAFROTH. There is no question that if there is negligence, if officials are loafing upon their jobs, or if there is a clear intention of avoiding work or anything of that kind, of course there ought to be criticism; but what seems to me to be unfair, Mr. President, is that men who are straining every nerve trying to get the Nation in a condition to make an effective fight instead of being encouraged are subjected to severe criticism for things beyond their control. Such critics do not take into account the difficulties we had to encounter at the beginning of this war; they do not take into consideration the fact that those difficulties were almost insurmountable. It seems to me that the weight of that fact ought to be kept in mind in any discussion of these problems.

Mr. President, I did not rise to make a speech. These suggestions have come to me since I have been on the floor, and have come largely from the newspaper containing Mr. Hurley's speech in New York last night that was handed to me while the Senator from Washington was addressing the Senate. It seems to me from the statements that are made concerning the Shipping Board, the Aircraft Board, and other war work of the Government, that the results have been truly wonderful, especially when we consider that it has taken us less time to accomplish the results achieved than it took England, although England was much further advanced toward a war footing than we were. It seems to me that we should be congratulated upon the fact that such good and effective work has been done. Let us stop such unfair criticism and bend every energy toward the winning of the war.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. OWEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair promised to recognize the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not rise to interrupt the Senator. I rise to take the floor.

Mr. OWEN. I have made a point of order against an item on page 5 of the appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That can be withheld for a while, can it not?

Mr. OWEN. How long does the Senator wish to occupy the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know; that depends on how much I am interrupted.

Mr. OWEN. Will not the Senator let me make the point of order? It will only take a moment to dispose of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I make the point of order that the amendment to which I have referred, on page 5, is general legislation on an appropriation bill. There is no question about the point of order being well founded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the next passed-over amendment be read.

Mr. OWEN. I now offer an amendment to come in on page 66, after line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 66, after line 4, at the end of the item relating to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, from funds on deposit to the credit of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, the sum of \$15,000 to be used for construction and equipment of dormitories at the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla., and to be immediately available in addition to the sum of \$50,000 provided for the same use by section 18 of the Indian appropriation act of March 2, 1917.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs justifying this item. The purpose of the amendment is to use funds of the Chickasaw Nation for the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo. I ask that the letter from the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the request will be complied with.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, March 25, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. HASTINGS: Referring to your inquiry in regard to the proposed construction of the dormitories for the Murray State School of Agriculture, Tishomingo, Okla., I wish to say that bids have just been received for the construction of the two dormitories in accordance with the plans and specifications which had been presented by the authorities of the school, and the lowest bid so received is in the sum of \$54,400. You will recall that the appropriation carried in the Indian appropriation act of March 2, 1917, was for \$50,000, for constructing and equipping these buildings, and therefore the bid in question is \$4,400 in excess of the amount which is available for construction of the buildings, exclusive of equipment, and approximately \$10,000 will be required for this purpose.

Very truly, yours,

E. B. MERITT,
Assistant Commissioner.

HON. W. W. HASTINGS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand from the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning and from reports in the newspapers of what occurred yesterday that there was a most pathetic appeal from the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] for "pitiless publicity," and that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] exclaimed in terms that thrilled everybody: "Let the truth be known." But for that fact I would not communicate what I am now going to communicate to the Senate, and through the Senate to the country. I have just received a cablegram from the front in France. It is in my own private cipher, unknown to Germany, or the allies, or President Wilson, and I therefore can not send it up to the desk and ask to have it read at the desk because the Secretary can not decipher and read it. I shall, therefore, be forced to read it myself:

MARCH 26, 1918.

HON. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Senior Senator from Mississippi:

Most critical day of this long and hard battle. Withstood attacks of the Teutons here with comparative satisfaction. Huns attacked with infantry, cavalry, heavy and light artillery, aeroplanes, and gas. Had to give way a bit, but are not downhearted. Rumor of attack on Washington. How about it?

To which I sent this reply:

Purely a gas attack—poisonous, of course, if it had got us. Enemy was carefully prepared; we were in a measure taken unawares; most of us not present; but, in the providence of God, the wind shifted and the enemy was stifled.

(Signed) JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, it just so happens that while the Wisconsin election is taking place, between loyalists and disloyalists of the United States, this attack by poison gas in the Senate of the United States was made, and I am sorry to say not only made upon the Republican side, but partially followed up upon the Democratic side—just about the time when we were trying to determine whether in Wisconsin a man in the past lukewarmly attached to America and the allies was to be elected to the Senate or a man who all the time has been outspoken and absolutely patriotic. There was no connection, of course; I do not charge that there was; it was just accidental; it was just incidental; it just happened that way; and it just happened that what aid and assistance was given to it on this side was the aid and assistance of those who also had been in the past somewhat lukewarm in their support of the administration and therefore in their Americanism.

Mr. President, the men at the head of the Shipping Board, the Aircraft Board, and the other boards of the Government preparing for the war are, as a rule, prominent Republicans of the country. They are true, patriotic, and honest in every sense of the word. It is not against them that they are Republicans; it is in their favor under a Democratic administration that they are; but I mention the fact merely to show that these men, who were probably recommended by Republican Senators, are the people at fault, if anybody is. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that anybody is, except that, of course, now and then we find a man put in charge of a job who is not equipped for the job. He may be a Republican; he may be a Democrat; he may be a Populist; he may be a Socialist; he may be anything.

The peculiarity of this entire attack consists in this, that there is no attack on the patriotism or the motives of any man who is trying to do this war work; we are all trying to do it; but upon the very day that is the most critical day in this long and hard fought battle in Flanders and France, which the house of Hohenzollern is carrying on against the forces of civilization, it happens that this gas attack was made in the city of Washington in the Senate against this administration.

Who doubts the honor, who doubts the honesty, who doubts the patriotism, who doubts the earnestness of the head of this administration? Who dare utter publicly such a doubt? I pause for a reply.

If anybody is to blame, Democrats and Republicans both are to blame, but neither of the two parties is to blame as a party at all. If anybody is to be blamed, it is the American people, and the American Congress representing the American people. Whether you blame them or not depends upon your standpoint. I do not blame them, because I think their conduct in the past has been right. It has been the conduct of a people prepared for peace, for progress, for industry, and unprepared for war, believing in their hearts, as I myself believed before this war began, that the time had passed when any autocracy or aristocracy or dynasty could plunge the world into murderous assault. You thought so as well as I; it was the American policy; and the American policy was right. It was to keep unprepared for war in order that we might be prepared for peace, for industry, for progress, for education, for civilization; but here you stand upon the 26th of this month with the Kaiser and the Huns, in more senses than one the descendants of the men who worshipped Woden and Thor and who are worshipping Woden and Thor to-day, rather than the gentle Jesus that walked by the lake of Galilee, with these Huns while they were making a final last effort to prove that might was right; that strength and force and discipline and effectiveness could overcome righteousness and mercy and love and civilization in this world. It just so happened that you selected that day to make an evidently prepared attack upon this American administration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Senator to yield to me because I know of the patriotism of the Senator from Mississippi, and I am certain that he recognizes that I am as patriotic and as earnest for winning this war as any man in the United States, and that I will not recognize any party during this war in the matter of conducting the war; that we must win, and we must win unitedly; and we must lay aside our party prejudices and our affiliations wherever and whenever they conflict with our duty to support our Government. But I want to ask the Senator if he does not think that possibly he may have been a little unfair in a statement which he has just made concerning the battle in Wisconsin, in which he says, if I understood him correctly, that it is a battle to determine whether one who has

been merely lukewarm shall be made a Senator of the United States, or one who has been for the Government and right and patriotic all the time?

I want to say that I agree with the Senator that if either one of those two men that are pitted against each other has been lukewarm in this great battle, then he ought to be defeated. We do not want anyone in the Senate of the United States today who is lukewarm. But I have understood that both candidates have conducted their campaign on the standard of Americanism and the battle for Americanism; and I have understood, also, that both Mr. LENROOT and Mr. DAVIES have at all times been earnest, patriotic American citizens, each of them ready to do anything in his power to win this war. If that is true, then any statement that goes out from so patriotic a Senator as the Senator from Mississippi which would challenge the patriotism of one of these candidates, if it is not well founded, is an injustice, and I know that the Senator himself would be the first to correct it if he thought it was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota and I know one another well enough to know that neither one of us has ever been from the beginning of this controversy, from the sinking of the *Lusitania* down to now, in the slightest degree lukewarm toward the cause of the American Government. He has not been; there is too much Scotch in him. I have not been; there is too much Welsh in me. But, Mr. President, I am not prepared to apologize or explain what I said a moment ago, if I am correctly informed. The gentleman in whose behalf this attack upon the administration has operated—whether it was so intended or not I can not say—was the gentleman who, I understand, voted in favor of an embargo against our sending food or munitions of war to Europe, on the ground that it all had to go to the allies, while Germany could not receive any. The same man, if I understand his record correctly—and if I misunderstand it anywhere I hope to be corrected—is a man who voted against allowing our merchant ships to arm themselves for self-defense while they were subjected to the villainous and assassinate attacks of the German submarines. The same man, if I understand correctly—and about that I may be mistaken—voted against the declaration of war against Germany after we had received the injury of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and the insult of telling us that we could have a little part of the high seas to sail in and trade in, provided our vessels went painted like a barber's pole! If I find that I am incorrect about any of that, I shall stand corrected; but if I am not incorrect about any of it, then I say he was lukewarm. It is too late when he is seeking a Senatorship to profess ultrapatriotism.

The Senator says that after the campaign started in Wisconsin both candidates placed themselves upon record as being ultrapatriotic. One of them went so far as to say that patriotism alone was his platform.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute. But "as the twig is bent, so the tree grows"; and as the man before we declared war was prepared to defend the honor of America or otherwise, so he remains biased, pro or con, later, and he can not help it.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason I interrupt the Senator is because he asked to be interrupted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that Mr. LENROOT did not vote against the declaration of war with the Imperial German Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So much of that statement which I have made, then, is a mistake, and is acknowledged as one, because I know that the Senator from Utah would not tell me it was an error unless it was; but the other facts remain. Here we were with our rights upon the high seas, American citizens insisting that a neutral had a right to his life when he sailed upon the high seas; and here were these men, including Mr. LENROOT, asking the Government of the United States to tell an American citizen that he should not sail upon a neutral ship, or upon a belligerent ship owned by a private party. Here were these men insisting upon an embargo to keep us from sending food or fuel or munitions to Europe, our undoubted neutral right. Here were these men voting against arming our merchant ships to defend themselves against deep-sea assassins. Am I mistaken upon either one of those positions? If I am upon either, I will correct it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked that up; but I did look up the other question when the charge was first made in the public press, and I know that the first charge is not true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the first charge?

Mr. SMOOT. As to the declaration of war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that is all right; I have corrected that. The Senator's statement is sufficient.

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator asked me if he was correct in the other two charges.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The other three.

Mr. SMOOT. I say I have not looked up that question; but I want to say that if the charge is correct, there were Senators here who voted for it—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a moment; and there were Members of the House—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Democratic Members of the House—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Who voted for it; and since then the President has appointed them to responsible positions in the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say this: I am no longer a Democrat nor a Republican while this war lasts. I am not a partisan at all. I will vote against any Democrat nominated for office in the State of Mississippi, Bourbon Democratic as I am and as it is, if the Republicans nominate a man more loyal than he is. Now, that is a good deal, coming from a Bourbon Southern Democrat. I will face every situation that can put itself forward in my own State; and I am not condemning any Republican who is lukewarm in this war any more than I am condemning any Democrat who is equally so. I do not care a continental cent about his partisan politics, and I am asking you not to care. I am asking you to take the same position that I take—that if one man has been either unpatriotic, or even lukewarm, and another man of the opposite party to yours or to mine runs against him, support the man in the opposite party; and I am pledging you a word that so far has never been consciously violated that I will follow that course, even in the State of Mississippi, Southern Bourbon Democratic State as it is.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that there has not been a power asked for, there has not been an appropriation made—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, the Senator must pardon me. If the Senator rises to ask a question, I will yield. I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the relationship of the Republican Party toward the appropriation bills and the tax bills and all that. The Republicans as a whole have been patriotic and true to the country. Take that admission. Now, I decline to yield any further.

Mr. SMOOT. I just wanted to make this explanation to the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I decline to yield any further, unless the Senator wants to ask a question. I did not get up here to make a long speech.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator asked me a question, and I simply rose to answer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, what is it?

Mr. SMOOT. Now, I do not care about answering it nor do I care whether the Senator asks the question or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the question? I do not remember asking the Senator any question.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I asked the Senator any question which he has not either answered or attempted to answer, I do not remember it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. As Mr. DAVIES has never been a Member of either House of Congress, how does the Senator know what Mr. DAVIES would have done had he been a Member?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not, of course, know what he might or might not have said on the floor of either House.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody except God knows what a man who has never been a pig would have said if he had been a pig.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all right; but let the Senator answer my question civilly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am answering it civilly. No man can answer a question as to what a man would have said if he had been a lawyer, if it be admitted that he was not a lawyer.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. If Mr. LENROOT to-day puts himself on the same platform of patriotism that Mr. Davies does—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course he does.

Mr. GALLINGER (continuing). What right has the Senator from Mississippi to go back and find out that Mr. LENROOT exercised his judgment precisely as some Democrats exercised theirs?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; and the Democrats who exercised their judgment in the same way that Mr. LENROOT did were lukewarm to America.

Mr. GALLINGER. But one of them, at least, has been appointed by the President to high office since then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not help that.

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be. It may be that it was done with the hope that he would prove less lukewarm in the future. I do not know. I am not criticizing your party. I am not criticizing mine. I am merely trying to show that Republican criticisms of the Democratic administration are unwarranted whenever they are partisan.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi further yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator seems to put himself on a plane of patriotism higher than other men. I do not agree to that at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; not higher than other men, but upon a plane of patriotism very much higher than men placed themselves who voted against letting American merchant ships arm themselves to prevent assassination, and upon a plane of patriotism very much higher than men placed themselves who wanted to vote for an embargo against America's exercising her neutral rights of sending munitions and arms and fuel to Europe. Now, in that much I place myself upon a superior plane, yes; I do not care whether it affects Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. GALLINGER. With the permission of the Senator from Mississippi, I want to say that it is a trifle late in the day for the Senator to be putting himself on a higher plane of patriotism than some of the rest of us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not put the Senator from New Hampshire on a lesser plane. He voted right all the time, so far as I know.

Mr. GALLINGER. I support Mr. LENROOT. The Senator supports Mr. Davies, as the Vice President does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I suppose the Senator is supporting Mr. LENROOT simply because Mr. LENROOT is the Republican candidate; and if Mr. LENROOT had been the Democratic candidate and our man had been the Republican candidate he would have voted to support Davies.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I assume, if the Senator will permit me, that the Vice President of the United States, who has left his seat in the Senate and is now on the stump in Wisconsin advocating Mr. Davies's election, is doing it because he is a Democrat.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That was the cause of all this.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume that he is supporting Mr. Davies because he is a Democrat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That reminds me of something which I had very nearly forgotten. I believe perhaps the occasion, if not the cause, of this outbreak against the administration was that the Vice President of the United States has gone to Wisconsin to make speeches.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; we do not care anything about that. It is not important.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment; I will yield in a minute. I am not sure of that; the Senator from New Hampshire denies it, but it is another of those remarkable coincidences where one of two things may be the cause of the other and one the effect of the other, or where it may be a mere accident that they coincide. But, at any rate, the objection of the Senator from New Hampshire, and his mention of the fact that the Vice

President had gone to Wisconsin, rather strengthens me in the suspicion that I had to a slight degree formerly entertained, of partisan Republican bias in the attack of March 26 evidently concerted.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is oversuspicious on that point.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator has intimated, or the Senator has said, that Mr. LENROOT's vote on the McLemore resolution was unpatriotic. Does the Senator know that his own representative in the House voted the same as Mr. McLemore did?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Who is my own representative? I did not know I had any.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Sisson.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh! Oh! [Laughter.] Mr. President, I did not know I had any representative in the House, and I have not learned so yet.

Now, Mr. President, I am making no partisan speech, unless a speech in defense be a partisan speech.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; although I wanted to conclude.

Mr. CALDER. May I ask, Does the Senator imply that the Representative from the district in which he resides is also disloyal because—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman whom the Senator mentions is not the Representative from the district in which I reside.

Mr. CALDER. At least, he is from the Senator's State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; from the same State; but the Senator calls him my representative. I never made him my representative. He is not my representative yet. I do not want to be reduced to the point of talking about men by name. I have not done that thus far.

Mr. CALDER. But the Senator referred—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not defended anybody that cast that sort of vote, and I am not going to defend him; I do not care where he came from, nor to what party he belongs; and the Senator can not charge any of it up to me, no matter how anxious he may be to do it.

Mr. President, I do not know that I know the American people any better than anybody else does. I am rather inclined to think that maybe I do not know them as well as a great many other people in the Senate and House know them, because if there is a man living who recognizes the fact that he is to a certain extent a provincialist, I am the man. It may be that I can not size up public opinion in the far North, Northeast, and Northwest as well as some other men from some other sections of the country. I am a southerner, with a southerner's prejudices, and a southerner's traditions, and a southerner's ideals, and a southerner's limitations, which are great. But, Mr. President, if I do know the American people, I know this about them, that they are ready to forgive errors when errors are ascertained by the makers of them and rectified; and that, whether ascertained and rectified or not, if the entire policy comes out successfully, and upon the whole is efficacious and effective, they are ready to give praise to the policy rather than quarrel with it on account of its little defects. That is my opinion of the American people.

There have been those who have said, "Do not judge other people by yourself"; but I have always thought that there was no other way of judging other people except by myself. That would be my way of judging this thing, and I therefore believe it is the way of every fair and honest and patriotic American to judge it.

Now, of course, it is an easy thing, with a million or two million men called from the pursuits of peace to warlike endeavor and high daring; with a Navy to be increased two or three fold; with airplanes to be built, even without factories in which to build them; with guns to be manufactured; with clothing manufacturing to be deflected from the ordinary clothing of the ordinary people to uniforms and overcoats of the soldiers; with troops to be sent abroad before the troops had the big guns and the airplanes; with our ally, France, begging us to send them, begging us to send them without guns or appliances, and saying that she could supply them just as well and more cheaply—of course it is easy, under all that state of affairs, to go around and find where John Thompson sometimes suffered from the inefficiency of this entire, great, revolutionized system, and where Jim Smith fell helpless in a hospital because a Government calling millions of men into camp, organizing improvisatorially—if I may manufacture a word—a force of surgeons

found now and then a man who has got a commission as a surgeon who did not know anything about medicine and did not know anything about surgery. Of course, when you come forward with the case of Jim Johnson or Billy Thompson and face me with it, and you are a truthful and an honest man, I take it for granted that you know all about the case of Jim Johnson or Billy Thompson, and I can not meet it. You can go out and get 10 more cases like it, and I can not meet them. I could arraign the Union Government and the Confederate Government during the War between the States, if I did nothing but go out and hunt mistakes and incidental cruelties and sufferings falling to the lot of individuals on one side or the other because of inefficiency and ineffectiveness of men in high station, or in comparatively high station; and I could forever damn the Federal Government and the Confederate Government, both. But history will forever recite the fact that the Nation that "rose and fell without a stain" rose and fell as a very effective fighting force on this earth, and that the Nation which conquered her was still more effective in spite of all the little faults of both. Yet there were men in the Federal Army and in the Confederate Army who mistook measles for scarlet fever, and mistook rash for one or the other, and there were men who went out under Mr. Lincoln's commission as brigadier generals and colonels that were not fit to command a company, as there were men who went out under Jeff Davis's commissions in the same way.

Mr. President, you can take your choice and have it one way or the other, but you can not have it both ways. You can not "keep your cake and eat your cake," both. You can either be a great, civilized Nation, devoted to progress and to the happiness of the human race, consecrated to the cause of liberty, worshipping Jesus of Nazareth, the God of mercy and of love, pursuing the avocations of peace, and preparing in peace for more peace as God shall give it to you, with still greater prosperity—you can be that, or you can be, upon the other hand, a military Nation, prepared off the bat to fight the world if the world dares come, sacrificing education, sacrificing religion, setting aside mercy and righteousness and love in the great business of being ready to whip the other fellow, or to attack and conquer the other fellow. You can be that; and if you are, you would be very much more efficient for war than you would be if you occupied the former standpoint. But, Mr. President, after you get through, and after you have trained a generation or two of men in that sort of so-called efficient way, they are—these men whom you have trained and mistaught—no longer American citizens, dedicated to the cause of liberty and consecrated to the cause of humanity, but they are machines—they are not even machines, they are bolts in machines; and the country which they would constitute would not be worth the trouble of any man's dying for it, much less the trouble of any man's living for it.

Of course, we were a people prepared for peace, and not prepared for war; and I thank God that except when we had to go into war in self-defense in the days gone by, we determined rather to take our chances when war should come, to "muddle through" as best we could two, three, four, maybe seven years—hardly longer—than to keep oppressing the people with the down weight of taxes, of financial and home burdens, taking not only the money of the citizen but the life of the citizen for two or three years to train him to whip somebody when a war came.

Now, we are going through it all right. Upon the 26th, which was yesterday, the Teutons on the other side of the water—these people who worship the god of military efficiency and of might, who are the descendants of the men who worshiped Thor and Woden and who are still to-day substantially worshipping Thor and Woden—made their attack in all their magnificent panoply, superior in coordination, superior in discipline, superior in efficiency, man for man, to the men who stood in front of them, no matter how superior the men who stood in front of them may have been as men and not mere bolts in a military machine.

They made their attack with all that superiority, and up to the last hour we have heard from, thank God, we are still holding them, in spite of guns that shot 66 miles, in spite of a long 40 years' preparation of airplanes and machine guns, and big guns, and infantry, and Uhlans and other cavalry inferior to them, man to man and company to company, in discipline, in military efficiency, although their superiors, as we are, in intellect and in the love of righteousness and mercy and devotion to the cause of love and humanity on this earth.

It is long since we English and Americans and French passed the period when we believed that might was right. It is a long time ago since we passed the period when we believed that if you wanted anything from your neighbor all you had to justify yourself was to have troops enough to go and take it. We stood the battle there in Flanders on the 26th. Suppose it goes against us.

There is too much pessimism in America here lately. I am tired of it. Suppose the worshippers of Woden and Thor break through between the French and the English? Suppose they throw the French back upon Paris and throw the English back upon the coast? Suppose, what I do not believe is possible, that they surround and capture the French Army, with the city of Paris! Suppose that Italy gets discouraged and quits! Suppose the English Army has to make embarkation at Dunkirk and Calais and Bordeaux and get back to the "tight little island" as best it may and leave a whole lot of dead and prisoners behind them! Suppose it all happens, am I downhearted? No. I believe that the two great English-speaking races can withstand the attack of the entire continent of Europe, even if they made Russia and France active allies, and they will have a hard time doing it. They may do it with Russia; they can not do it with France.

Mr. President, for God's sake, why is it that we can not obey the injunction of Charles Kingsley and "hold our hearts up higher for those who are fighting afar," instead of coming into this Senate about once a week in an apparently prepared and preconceived way for the purpose of throwing doubt upon the efficiency and the ability of our governmental machinery?

We of this generation are not responsible for our governmental machinery. The Constitution tells us how we shall elect a President and Senators and Representatives and how all the other officers shall be appointed. We find some of you complaining about machinery who do not want to give the President even the liberty to swap machinery. I find some of you holding the Senate back when the President is asking you when here is a round peg in a square hole or a square peg in a round hole to let him swap them. One of these pegs happens to be in one department and the other happens to be in another. He, the President, says, "I can use them both if you will leave me free and give me some elasticity of authority," and while you enemies of the administration are criticizing out of one corner of your mouth the inefficiency of his executive force you refuse out of the other side of your mouths to give him power to help himself.

Mr. President, it is a sad day for America when upon the 26th of March there ought to have been heard paeans of praise, not for success, for no man can claim or boast of success, but every man can deserve it—not for success, but for the fact that our allies and our own boys, as far as they were in it, had at least deserved success. Instead of this Chamber ringing with paeans of praise upon that day, telling how nobly and steadfastly our allies have stood, how bravely they have died, how the God of their religion, the God of love and mercy and righteousness and civilization might have taken them up under His two hands and lifted them to heaven as they died; instead of all this, so richly deserved, this great Nation, as it is represented in the Senate of the United States, presented the spectacle of a debate as to how many airplanes we had a year or something else—hypercriticism, supercriticism, mere partisan quarrelsomeness.

Now, I can not go into details about airplanes and things, because I do not know anything about it. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has gone into the details to some extent. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] did it the other day, and some of the other Senators did. Mr. Hurley has made a statement to the House committee. I do not know much about it; but I do know this and you know it, too, every one of you, and not one of you dare deny it—I pause for denial—it is that if there has been any falling down, if there has been any failure, and of course there must be both, with all this great revolution of an entire people in the revolution of aspirations, ideals, and purposes, from peace and progress to war and destruction—you know as well as I do, and not one of you dare say to the contrary, that every man charged with the responsibility was doing the best he knew how. If you had been in his place, you could not have done any better than you knew how.

What greater devotion can a man give to his country than to do his best? Who says that any of these men has not done his best? It may be true that some of them are square pegs in round holes and somebody else ought to be put in their places, and that they ought to be kicked out; but it is also true that the administration has been following the weeding out process as well as it could and has weeded out thousands upon thousands; and it is also true that whenever a man was weeded out that, if he got a pull, he came to his Senator or Representative to get weeded back. Is not that true?

Mr. President, I want to repeat one more thing and then I am going to sit down. As far as I am concerned, for the balance of this war I know no Democracy and I know no Republicanism. I am for men who are hot-bloodedly and aggressively and offen-

sively, if necessary. Americans, antihyphenates; and I am against men who are lukewarm, cold-hearted even when they are not unpatriotic, or who, recent converts, have been so in the past. I will vote against any Republican in the class I have described, upon the one side, for any Democrat in the class I have described, upon the other. A Bourbon southern Democrat by tradition and environment and aspirations and love, as I am. If the Republican Party at the next election would nominate a man who had been absolutely patriotic and true from the beginning, not only from the declaration of war but before it took place, aggressively and absolutely in favor of American rights and American honor, and the Democrats were to nominate a man whose record upon that subject I considered doubtful I would vote for the Republican and ask God to forgive me for the first offense of that sort I had ever committed in my life. [Laughter.]

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have surrendered the floor.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is making a declaration now as to whom he would vote for. I should like to know what the Senator would do if confronted with the record of a Republican who had supported the President in every instance according to the Senator's own ideas, and—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not contending that the support of the President—

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator allow me? I speak of one who in every instance had voted with the Senator. Suppose the Senator in a State was confronted with the candidacy of that man upon the Republican ticket and an unknown man with no record whatsoever upon the Democratic ticket, for whom would he vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I answer very frankly, I would try to find out the unknown man. [Laughter.] If I found that the unknown man, from my inquiries, even though he had not been hallowed as a Member of the House or the Senate in his entire life course, had shown the utmost patriotism and the utmost aggressive Americanism, I would vote for him against the Republican, because as between the two equally meritorious I would stand by my party, and so would the Senator stand by his party.

Mr. FALL. But suppose the Democrat had no record of any kind or character but was unknown.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not hit this case. The Democrat in this particular case has a record.

Mr. FALL. I am not hitting at any case—far from it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I go further. If I found in the case the Senator mentions that that so-called Democrat pretending to the utmost loyalty and patriotism and Americanism had never displayed any until after he was nominated, I would not vote for him.

Mr. FALL. The Senator means that if there had been no opportunity for the Democrat to proclaim his loyalty from the housetops.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not.

Mr. FALL. The only politics injected here has been injected by the Senator this afternoon, in so far as I have heard, and he has persisted in his entire speech to inject politics.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will take one minute more to answer that. That statement is absolutely incorrect. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that in committee service and in service upon this floor I have attempted to the best of my ability to avoid partisan politics since this war began, and that so far as I have entered that field to-day I have entered it only in defense of an attack of an iron hand in velvet gloves, in my opinion largely induced by partisan motives made upon the 26th of March, while the other enemies of this administration were attacking us in Flanders. I may have been mistaken, but that was my motive.

Mr. FALL. No one else referred to the Wisconsin election, and the Senator, giving full play to his imagination—

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, Mr. President, if a man attacks me sub rosa and with velvet gloves and does not say the why nor wherefore, and if I undertake to tell that I suspect his why and wherefore, then I am to be put in the attitude of attacking and he is to be put in the attitude of defense?

Mr. FALL. Any possible word that may be uttered here, not in laudation of some candidate upon the Democratic ticket, or in laudation of some act of some Democratic official, but in any way tending to criticize the acts of such official, or tending to call attention to some one, is called disloyalty. If any attention is called to any act of omission that such act may be corrected, if it happens to be a Democratic official who is guilty of the omission or the commission, that is disloyal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just want to say this, and then I am going to give up the floor. If the object of the criticism is to correct and rectify, then the criticism should be made first not upon this floor but to the executive department, to the proper official. I have had several cases, in two of which I demanded a court-martial and have gotten it, and in both cases the persons of whom I complained as misusing their authority have been removed, one of them by an agreement to resign and the other otherwise. If the object of the criticism of the Government in time of war is to rectify mistakes, then at least the privilege ought to be given to the head of the department under which the mistake has been made of reporting it to him and trying to get relief there before it is exploited here as a cause of complaint and attack, and aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OWEN. Where is my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is before the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to occupy two or three minutes.

Mr. OWEN. I was in hopes that we could have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the partisan speech made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], I desire to occupy only a few moments of the Senate's time.

I hold in my hand the document entitled "First Session of the War Congress," October, 1917, issued by Charles Merz, and printed as a public document. This is a document issued by the Committee on Public Information. I want to call the attention of the Senate and, in view of what has been said by the Senator from Mississippi, the attention of the country to this record on page 10.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has gone out of his way to attack a Republican candidate for the Senate in Wisconsin, and yet on page 10 of this document, when that candidate was a Member of the House and was not a candidate for the Senate, this administration quotes from one of his speeches in the House and gives to the country an expression from him showing of its loyalty. I challenge any man upon the other side to point to any document issued by this administration praising the Democratic candidate, Mr. Davies, for any expression of loyalty uttered by him.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is that from the Creel bureau?

Mr. CURTIS. It is from the Creel bureau; and on page 10 they quote the following from Mr. LENROOT. The first is a quotation from Mr. SHERLEY; the second is a quotation from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]; and the third and only other quotation is the one from Mr. LENROOT, of Wisconsin, and I want to read it.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if he can name the members of the Publication Bureau?

Mr. CURTIS. They were appointed by the President, and the bureau is composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and Mr. Creel, as I am informed.

When a man is selected under the draft there will be no stigma upon him. He will walk out from his community, and his neighbors will point to him and say, "There is a man who has been chosen by our country for distinguished service. He is going to fight for us." That is the selective draft. But upon the failure of the volunteer system when conscription is resorted to what is the situation? The finger of scorn and of shame is pointed at the conscript then, and he has the mark of a coward and a slacker upon him. Which shall we choose?

Those are the words that this Bureau of Information quotes with approval from the distinguished Member of the House, spoken while a Member of the House, and now this administration seeks to discredit him because he is the Republican candidate for the United States Senate.

I hope the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] will read to the Senate a letter that was written by the President of the United States in behalf of a Democratic candidate for Congress in an Indiana district to fill a vacancy where he vouched for that man's loyalty and asked for his election, and yet that man in the House, as shown by the Record, voted the same as did Mr. LENROOT upon the McLeMore resolution referred to. I hope that letter may be printed in the Record by the Senator from Utah.

In addition to that I want to call the attention of the country to this fact: I have in my hand the record of every vote cast in the Senate during the war Congress, and of the votes cast on the Republican side 76 per cent plus were for the war propositions, while on the Democratic side the votes cast for these same war measures were 75 per cent minus. That is the record upon which we Republicans stand. It is the best evidence of our loyalty, and we challenge the other side to contradict it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the last three years there has never been a Republican Senator speak in opposition to any

administrative program but immediately some Senator upon the other side of the Chamber would arise in his seat and charge the Republican Party with disloyalty and with playing politics, and it has generally fallen to the lot of the Senator from Mississippi when not preempted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

Mr. President, I think more of my country than I do of my party, and if ever the welfare of America conflicts with the principles or policies of my party I will be found defending the former. Practically all the Republicans of the Senate and House have laid aside party lines since the declaration of war and have voted for legislation asked for by the President, though much of it has been revolutionary and socialistic in character and in some cases unjustifiable and unnecessary. No Republican has sought to secure party advantage by calling attention of the country to the admitted blunders of the administration in power. No word of warning of the extravagant and wicked waste of the people's money or weaknesses in the efficiency of the administration have been even intimated in debate, but some Democrat would immediately arise and claim no good could come to the country from such warning and would only bring joy to the Kaiser; also that the present was not the time for partisan action. Every request for power or money must be granted without question.

How different the course of our Democratic brethren when an election of a Democrat is at stake in any part of this country! The very first election after the declaration of war developed that nonpartisanship was to apply to Republicans only and that every Democrat, from the President to the lowest and least officeholder, was to direct his efforts, in Congress and out, to the advancement of the interests of the Democratic Party. I grant that neither by expressed utterances or by implication, neither by precept nor by example has the President advised the American people to diminish their interest in party welfare or their activity in the promotion of party interest.

From the day of his inauguration as President of all the people of the United States down to March 20, when he wrote a letter to the Democratic reorganization meeting in Newark, N. J., President Wilson has regarded himself as the head of that party, and that party as the necessary agency for efficient and loyal administration of the affairs of this Government. No man while occupying the White House has ever uttered strictures against his political opponents as severe as those President Wilson uttered in his Indianapolis speech on January 8, 1915; and nothing that he has since said, either as President or in his private capacity as a citizen, nor anything that he has since done by official or private act, has indicated any change in his distrust of the Republican Party.

This much, therefore, may be said in his praise, that while he is a most intense partisan, and persists in that partisanship in time of war just as he did in time of peace, yet he makes no pretense of being other than a partisan, and in this respect is dealing frankly with the American people. From first to last he has shown his partisanship by his appointments; by his refusal to accept the proffered service of a most capable man affiliated with that party which is the leading rival of his own. By his active support of partisan candidates not only national but local he has demonstrated his belief that not even the exigencies of war require the laying aside of partisan lines, partisan organization, and partisan activity. In fact, his own party, under his direction, was the first to organize extensively for the campaigns of 1918 and 1920, and is to-day far more active than has been any other political committee, either Democratic or Republican, at this distance of time before an election. The only rumored instance that I now call to mind in which there was even a semblance of abandonment of partisanship on the part of President Wilson was in his reported expression of a desire that a strong and popular Republican Senator, whose reelection was unquestionable, should be returned.

From the fact that a great many of President Wilson's admirers and fellow partisans have urged the abandonment of party activity during the continuance of the war, it has been assumed that President Wilson himself entertains such a view as to the policies that would best promote a unification of the American people in the great task of winning the war. But this has been an assumption unjustified by anything that the President has said or done. In every instance in which there is a possibility of Democratic success, and even when that possibility is very remote, the President's attitude has been such as to indicate a desire that his party leaders enter and continue a partisan contest with a determination to ask and give no quarter.

President Wilson deems the economic principles and policies of the Democratic Party superior to those of the Republican Party; he deems its chosen representatives better qualified to enact laws, interpret them, and administer them; and he looks upon both the principles and the personnel of the Republican

Party with distrust. Judging by his utterances he believes that loyalty to America begins and ends in the Democratic Party, with exceptions only in cases where members of other parties have been of temporary local service to him. Entertaining those views, it is to be expected that he would consistently advocate the election of Democrats to office. With equal consistency he will expect that all men who believe in the superiority of Republican principles and policies, and in the superiority of the representatives and personnel of the Republican Party to legislate and administer the affairs of Government, will support the candidates of that party as earnestly and as continuously as he supports the candidates of his own.

His most recent utterance in behalf of a Democratic candidate was his letter to Mr. Joseph E. Davies, who was nominated by the Democrats as their candidate for the senatorship in Wisconsin. That letter will serve to disclose the fact that not only was the President willing to use the prestige of his high office for partisan purposes in time of war but he was willing to cast aspersions upon the loyalty of members of his own party, and even to condemn his own actions in order to accomplish the present partisan task of electing a Democrat to the United States Senate.

The President declared in his letter to Mr. Davies that "the McLemore resolution, the embargo issue, and the armed-neutrality issue presented the first opportunities to apply the acid test in our country to disclose true loyalty and genuine Americanism." A resolution to which Mr. Davies sustained no relation, he not having been a Member of either House of Congress, and it was a resolution of Congress and therefore there was no opportunity to apply to Mr. Davies any test whatever. Yet the McLemore resolution received the support of then Representative Kent, of California, whom the President subsequently appointed to a position of trust and responsibility under the Government. Thus the President gave his official approval to a man who, according to his estimate of what constitutes an "acid test," had failed in true loyalty and genuine Americanism. It must not be forgotten that among the principal advocates of the embargo were a number of the Democrats of the Senate, who, if the President's estimate of what constitutes an acid test is correct, are lacking in true loyalty and genuine Americanism.

This present effort on the part of the President to secure the election of a strongly partisan Democrat in a strongly Republican State is entirely consistent with his previous partisan activities. In a congressional contest in New Hampshire over the election of a Representative to fill a vacancy, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who is the Democratic whip in this body and who is recognized as the spokesman of the President, went upon the stump and was so extreme in his appeals for the election of a Democrat that he declared that a vote for the Republican candidate would be a vote "for Prussianism and the Kaiser." I might add that Mr. Lewis is at the present moment on a similar mission in Wisconsin. In the campaign of 1917 for the election of a governor in the State of Massachusetts, one of the active Democratic speakers was Mr. Carl A. Vrooman, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who was proclaimed as the voice of the administration's opinions relating to the issues involved in the campaign. He declared that the Nation would regard it as a demonstration of patriotism if Massachusetts should elect for governor a member of the President's party. I admit that the appeal of the honored gentleman resulted in a Republican governor receiving a plurality of nearly 90,000, and the Massachusetts troops are still at the front.

The fact that in both New Hampshire and Massachusetts the voters disregarded these specious appeals and elected loyal and capable men of the Republican Party demonstrates that the majority of the people do not accept the assumption that patriotism and honesty and efficiency are the peculiar possession of members of the Democratic Party.

We must not forget the case of Hon. Finly H. Gray, of Indiana, whom the President claimed in a letter of indorsement dated June 19, 1917, had given his administration the most generous and cordial support during his two years' service in the House, notwithstanding Mr. Gray was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House and supported a minority report in opposition to the administration's policy of building more battleships, and that he made a speech against the administration's plan for an increase in the Navy, and declared that the building of more battleships was ridiculous, and that the proposition was monstrous and absurd. Mr. Gray's record shows that he opposed all manner of preparedness during his incumbency as a Representative, and yet his reelection would have afforded the President the greatest gratification, as admitted in his letter of June 19, 1917.

In his recent letter to the Democrats of New Jersey President Wilson concedes that his work can be properly done only if he devotes his whole thought and attention to it and thinks of nothing but the immediate task in hand. Nevertheless, he states that he can not overlook his responsibility as the leader of a great party and feels impelled to point out what he believes to be "the duty of the Democrats in New Jersey now and in the months to come, in order that the exigency of a great hour or crisis may properly be met." In his opinion the exigencies of this great hour and this crisis can properly be met only by the election of Democrats to office. He has made the issue; he has thrown down the gauntlet to those Americans who believe in the superiority of Republican principles and policies and in the greater ability of those men who constitute the Republican Party. It is an issue which Republicans have been willing either to ignore or to minimize. It is common knowledge, not only in both Houses of Congress but to the country at large, that in the consideration of measures either directly or indirectly bearing upon our war problems no Republican has permitted his party affiliations to influence in the least the opinions he expressed in debate or the vote he cast upon the passage of a measure. Republicans have been ready to come to the assistance of the President at any time and in any manner.

After Republicans have made such a splendid demonstration of their readiness to subordinate party interests and to join with the members of any and every other party in any and every effort to speed this war to a victorious end, they can now, in the maintenance of their own self-respect, take no course other than that of accepting the gage of battle as the President has drawn the battle lines and urge the election of Republicans as the representatives of the governmental principles and policies which we deem best for the permanent interests of the American Nation and most likely to contribute most effectively to the successful prosecution of the war and the wisest solution of the innumerable economic, financial, and social problems which will confront us.

Mr. President, we can only regret that our Commander in Chief in this stupendous war, around whom we rally to a man in his efforts to achieve victory, has not seen fit to abstain from partisan activities in contests for specific offices, and thereby reciprocate in spirit and deed the real nonpartisanship so essential to ultimate success.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call for a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. OWEN. I think I have the floor. I call attention to the pending amendment, which amendment appropriates \$15,000 out of the Chickasaw funds for the Murray Agricultural School, at Tishomingo. The item has been favorably reported by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; there is no objection to it from any quarter, and I see no reason why it can not be disposed of now.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I had thought during the address this afternoon of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to give utterance to a few thoughts at the conclusion of his remarks, but other business intervened; and, although it is late, I will now give utterance to a few of the thoughts that then occurred to me. I shall be very brief in doing so, owing to the lateness of the hour, and in what I may say there shall be no politics.

During the last few days there have been repeated accusations made on the floor of the Senate that executive officials of the Government have been deceiving the people. The charge has frequently been made here that officials of the executive branch of the Government were deceiving the people. That is a very serious charge, and I do not believe there is anything to justify or warrant it. The assertion that an official of the Government is attempting to deceive the American people should not be made without some proof. I can not conceive of any reason why any official of an executive department of this Government would undertake to deceive the American people, to tell them falsehoods, and to put them under false impressions; and there has been nothing offered here as proof of those assertions, which are wholly unjustified and unwarranted. Not a scintilla of proof has been offered.

For weeks past there has been almost daily a perfect tirade of criticism launched upon this floor against nearly every executive branch of the Government. Investigations have been set on foot as to nearly every branch of activity in the executive departments of the Government. A few weeks ago the people of this country were regaled by Members of this body with harrowing accounts of the suffering and neglect of our troops in the training camps and cantonments of the country.

The people were told that the soldier boys of the country were not receiving proper medical attention and care, and the appeal has been loudly made to let the people of the country know the facts. Let the people know the truth, is daily vociferously demanded in the Senate. Now, I want to tell a few facts and make known a little truth.

Dr. Charles H. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn., is one of the greatest medical and surgical authorities in this country. A short time ago he testified before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that up to the time of our entrance into this war the Japanese Army, at the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War, received the best medical care and attention and had the best sanitation that had ever been received by any army in the world; and he said that during the period when troops of the Japanese were in training in the training camps and cantonments of that country in preparation for war the deaths in the Japanese Army amounted to twenty to the thousand. That he said was the best record that had ever been made in the world up to the time of our entrance into the present war. He further stated that last winter, when weather and climatic conditions were at their worst in our training camps and cantonments, the deaths among our troops were less than ten to the thousand, and that thus our record in that respect was more than twice as good as the best that the world had ever known before.

I do not believe that anybody will gainsay Dr. Mayo's authority, his knowledge, or honesty in such matters. His great and unsurpassed ability is well known to the people of this country. He has proven his patriotism by giving up his great surgical practice, and he is now serving the people of this country as a surgeon with the rank of major in our Army, at a salary of \$3,000 per year, devoting his great talents to the care of our soldiers and the welfare and defense of our country. There is an illustration of how unjust and unfounded are many of the wild charges and bitter criticisms that are launched by Senators against the War Department and its operations. Yet we continue to be treated daily to a perfect tirade of criticism by the Members of this body of the War Department and its officials, who are even accused of deceiving the people. Nearly everything that the War Department does is savagely attacked and criticized. This body seems to devote a large part of its precious time to criticism, denunciation, investigation of nearly everything that the War Department does, and of nearly every other executive branch of the Government, and, in this connection, I here and now call attention to the fact that it has now been more than six months since charges of unfitness to serve in this body were filed in the Senate against a Member of this body, and nothing has been heard in this body about those charges since then. The people of the country are loudly demanding to know what has become of those charges and what will be done about them, but nothing is heard of them or said about them in this body.

I am not now saying anything about the merit or lack of merit of those charges. I want that understood. I have nothing to say as to that. I have no expression of opinion to make about it. I merely refer to the indisputable fact that the charges were filed here more than six months ago, and that this body is so busily engaged in criticizing, denouncing, and investigating other departments of the Government that it either has not the time or has not the disposition to investigate charges against one of its own Members. I believe that it would be far more becoming in this body to investigate charges against its own Members than to indulge in daily tirades of criticism and denunciation and demands for investigation of other branches of the Government.

The United States Senate may be the only perfect branch of this Government. The only perfect body in the world may be the United States Senate. The only perfect body, the only body which never makes any mistakes of judgment, may be the United States Senate. The only body of men which has no shortcomings, no failings, no faults, no derelictions, and has nothing to do but to point out errors, faults, and neglect in other branches of this Government may be the United States Senate; but I do not believe the people of this country believe it. I, for one, do not believe it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. OWEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock

and 50 minutes p. m., Wednesday, March 27, 1918) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

During the executive session,

EXTENSION OF ARBITRATION WITH FRANCE.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Arizona, the injunction of secrecy was removed from the following:

T. the Senate:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement between the United States and France, signed at Washington on February 27, 1918, extending for another period of five years the duration of the arbitration convention concluded between them on February 10, 1908.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 1, 1918.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the French Republic, signed at Washington on February 27, 1918, extending for another period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between the two Governments on February 10, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT LANSING.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1918.

AGREEMENT EXTENDING THE DURATION OF THE ARBITRATION CONVENTION OF FEBRUARY 10, 1908, BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic, desiring to extend for another five years the period during which the arbitration convention concluded between them on February 10, 1908, and extended by the agreement concluded between the two Governments on February 13, 1913, shall remain in force, have authorized the undersigned, to wit: Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States, and J. J. Jusserand, ambassador of the French Republic to the United States, to conclude the following agreement:

ARTICLE I.

The convention of arbitration of February 10, 1908, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic, the duration of which by Article III thereof was fixed at a period of five years from the date of the exchange of ratifications, which period, by the agreement of February 13, 1913, between the two Governments was extended for five years from February 27, 1913, is hereby extended and continued in force for the further period of five years from February 27, 1918.

ARTICLE II.

The present agreement shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the President of the French Republic, in accordance with the constitutional laws of France, and it shall become effective upon the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

Done in duplicate in the English and French languages at Washington, this 27th day of February, 1918.

ROBERT LANSING. [SEAL.]
JUSSERAND. [SEAL.]

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 26), 1918.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Orvil L. Larson to be postmaster at Thatcher in place of Elizabeth W. Layton, resigned. Office became presidential July 1, 1917.

CALIFORNIA.

Frances L. Musgrove to be postmaster at Arbutle in place of J. C. White, resigned.

Charles J. Hammond, jr., to be postmaster at Hayward in place of George E. Alexander, deceased.

Iona T. MacKenzie to be postmaster at Indio in place of Edward R. Neill, resigned.

Adolph E. Christensen to be postmaster at Selma in place of Walter Staley, removed.

COLORADO.

Agnes S. Jones to be postmaster at Fort Logan, Colo., in place of Elmo D. Matthews, resigned.

Edgar J. Bancroft to be postmaster at Palisades, Colo., in place of William D. Newton, deceased.

CONNECTICUT.

Joseph H. Derenthal to be postmaster at Madison, Conn., in place of Harry E. Slocum, resigned.

FLORIDA.

Fay H. Price to be postmaster at Umatilla, Fla., in place of Frank E. Whitcomb.

Stella Blocker to be postmaster at Coconut Grove, Fla., in place of William F. Albury, resigned.

Edward M. Luffman to be postmaster at Lake Helen, Fla., in place of Claude H. Pelton, resigned.

GEORGIA.

Merritt B. Brown to be postmaster at Richland, Ga., in place of James J. Gordy, removed.

Robert C. Ayers to be postmaster at Royston, Ga., in place of Robert L. Stephenson, removed.

Julian E. Hart to be postmaster at Sylvania, Ga., in place of Herschel S. White, resigned.

Walter W. Daves to be postmaster at Cartersville, Ga., in place of H. J. Jolly, resigned.

INDIANA.

Franc Mensel to be postmaster at Bremen, Ind., in place of William C. Foltz, resigned.

KANSAS.

Orla A. Granger to be postmaster at Glen Elder, Kans., in place of Alice W. Lee, removed.

Minnie A. Reed to be postmaster at Soldier, Kans., in place of A. F. Achenbach. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

KENTUCKY.

David C. Bradley to be postmaster at Scottsville, Ky., in place of Francis E. Bradley, resigned.

LOUISIANA.

Lucien L. Prothro to be postmaster at Lenzburg, La., in place of Patrick C. McLemore, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

L. Emma Hollister to be postmaster at Auburn, Mich., in place of Mary A. Deplonty, resigned.

Holger F. Peterson to be postmaster at Grayling, Mich., in place of John F. Hum, deceased.

MINNESOTA.

Margaret E. Gillespie to be postmaster at Carlton, Minn., in place of John Flynn, resigned.

Alfred J. Lamberton to be postmaster at Kasota, Minn., in place of S. M. Granger, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

John T. Griffin to be postmaster at Rolling Fork, Miss., in place of Argyle L. Brown, resigned.

Robert B. Cox to be postmaster at Batesville, Miss., in place of Nannie S. Smith, resigned.

Preston T. Smith to be postmaster at Ittabena, Miss., in place of Emma Morris Ray, removed.

MISSOURI.

Harvey H. Schooler to be postmaster at Fairfax in place of Arthur L. Carter, deceased.

John J. W. Donnegan to be postmaster at Herculaneum in place of Luther E. Thomas, resigned.

MONTANA.

Leroy W. Obershaw to be postmaster at Cascade in place of F. A. Tintinger, resigned.

Henry F. Fuerstnow to be postmaster at Joplin in place of Hans A. Nelson, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Harold Hjelmfelt to be postmaster at Holdrege in place of J. R. Cooper, deceased.

NEW YORK.

Frederick Theall to be postmaster at Hartsdale in place of Paul E. McManus, declined.

George H. Barwise to be postmaster at Port Henry in place of John H. Cronan, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA.

William H. Griffin to be postmaster at Pittsboro, N. C., in place of Lula F. Bland, resigned.

Benjamin J. Skinner to be postmaster at Farmville, N. C., in place of John V. Johnston, deceased.

Harry R. Hastings to be postmaster at Sylva, N. C., in place of J. J. Gray, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Jacob A. Phillips to be postmaster at Cleveland, N. Dak., in place of Judith M. Ahlen, resigned. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

OHIO.

Harold A. Carson to be postmaster at Bergholz, Ohio, in place of Harry E. Marshal, resigned.

Sage P. Deming to be postmaster at Rocky River, Ohio, in place of Louis Dean, resigned.

William J. Evans to be postmaster at North Canton (late New Berlin), Ohio, in place of William J. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

John P. Cummings to be postmaster at Waynesville, Ohio, in place of Frank C. Carey, deceased.

OKLAHOMA.

Harvey H. Harp to be postmaster at Gracemont, Okla., in place of Franz S. Lowry, removed.

Myrtle E. Morgan to be postmaster at Minco, Okla., in place of L. K. Bingham, resigned.

William H. Bell to be postmaster at Pryor, Okla., in place of James M. Keys, deceased.

Russell L. Floyd to be postmaster at Waynoka, Okla., in place of John L. Smith, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John D. Fulton to be postmaster at Langeloth, Pa., in place of Thomas B. McKaig. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Joseph A. McGrath to be postmaster at Falls Creek, Pa., in place of Glen S. Hamilton, resigned.

Thomas M. Reed to be postmaster at Frackville, Pa., in place of John Patrick Durkin, resigned.

Flora C. Harwi to be postmaster at Hellertown, Pa., in place of Harry J. Harwi, deceased. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1918.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Eva L. Fagan to be postmaster at Campobello, S. C., in place of Florence K. Metcalf. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank P. Wilson to be postmaster at Due West, S. C., in place of George M. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1916.

Cuttino M. Mellichamp to be postmaster at Edgefield, S. C., in place of Joseph P. Ouzts, deceased.

Toliver D. Earle to be postmaster at Landrum, S. C., in place of Rufus G. Durham, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

Beatrice J. Myers to be postmaster at Sewanee, Tenn., in place of Elizabeth Kirby-Smith, deceased.

TEXAS.

James A. Aldridge to be postmaster at Devine, Tex., in place of J. A. Kercheville, deceased.

James F. Atkinson to be postmaster at Florence, Tex., in place of Bessie Cannon, resigned.

John S. Munn to be postmaster at Junction, Tex., in place of J. Lester Hodges, resigned.

John Frank Highsmith to be postmaster at Menard, Tex., in place of Hugo E. Schuchard, resigned.

Joseph E. Abrahams to be postmaster at New Braunfels, Tex., in place of Gustave Reininger, removed.

Bratton C. Hardin to be postmaster at Rochester, Tex., in place of Henry G. Harcrow, resigned.

James K. Barry to be postmaster at Smithville, Tex., in place of William E. Jenkins, deceased.

John W. Grigg to be postmaster at Tulia, Tex., in place of W. B. Hutchison, deceased.

WASHINGTON.

Petrus Neilson to be postmaster at Enumclaw, Wash., in place of Anna P. Hanley, resigned.

Grover C. Schoonover to be postmaster at Odessa, Wash., in place of S. A. Stanfield, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA.

James A. Stephens to be postmaster at Follansbee, W. Va., in place of C. M. Brandon, removed.

Daisy D. McNemar to be postmaster at Petersburg, W. Va., in place of W. A. Ervin, deceased.

WISCONSIN.

Mattie M. Wilson to be postmaster at Belleville, Wis., in place of Thomas Wilson, resigned.

Wayne W. Beggs to be postmaster at Cameron, Wis., in place of J. F. Samson, resigned.

George Ward to be postmaster at Darlington, Wis., in place of L. B. Howerly, removed.

Theodore Holum to be postmaster at De Forest, Wis., in place of James McEntee, deceased.

Ferdinand A. Nierode to be postmaster at Grafton, Wis., in place of C. B. Carstens, deceased.

Agnes A. Pickett to be postmaster at Spencer, Wis., in place of M. C. Stollenow, removed.

Thomas M. Casey to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Wis., in place of F. A. Johnson, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, (legislative day of March 26), 1918.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joseph H. Lyon to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Charles R. Gross,
Second Lieut. Irvine L. McAllister,
Second Lieut. Robert G. Breene,
Second Lieut. James I. Gibbon,
Second Lieut. Walter C. Butler,
Second Lieut. Don Briley,
Second Lieut. Howard F. Long, and
Second Lieut. Benjamin Lufkin.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Leslie V. Jefferis,
First Lieut. Stuart A. Hamilton,
First Lieut. Howard F. Gill,
First Lieut. Gerald R. Butz,
First Lieut. Joseph W. Barker,
First Lieut. Shuey E. Wolfe,
First Lieut. Frank J. Atwood, and
First Lieut. Carl C. Terry.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lloyd W. Taylor,
Second Lieut. Guy H. Hearon,
Second Lieut. Francis E. Harrison, jr.,
Second Lieut. James W. Hopkins,
Second Lieut. Ralph E. Billsborrow,
Second Lieut. Alfred W. Chapman,
Second Lieut. William A. Emerson,
Second Lieut. Lawrence J. Meyns,
Second Lieut. James C. Vickery,
Second Lieut. Clarence E. Muehlberg,
Second Lieut. Edwin C. Higbee,
Second Lieut. William T. Andrews,
Second Lieut. Stoddard P. Johnston,
Second Lieut. Lewis A. Hudgins,
Second Lieut. Levi M. Bricker,
Second Lieut. Thomas P. Ahern,
Second Lieut. Lawrence Iverson,
Second Lieut. Herbert Macmillan,
Second Lieut. John P. MacNeill,
Second Lieut. Archibald L. Parmelee,
Second Lieut. Robert E. Ryerson,
Second Lieut. Sam H. Coile,
Second Lieut. Junius B. Peake,
Second Lieut. Sam W. Anderson,
Second Lieut. Richard B. Cross,
Second Lieut. Geoffrey A. Ogilvie, and
Second Lieut. John S. Cansler.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Armand Durant,
First Lieut. Thomas T. Handy,
First Lieut. Frank B. Tipton, jr.,
First Lieut. Stanley F. Bryan,
First Lieut. Oliver L. Haines,

To be second lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Robert A. B. Goodman,
 Second Lieut. Devereux C. Joseph,
 Second Lieut. Henry M. Rees,
 Second Lieut. John G. Paul,
 Second Lieut. James E. Brinckerhoff,
 Second Lieut. William G. Cummings,
 Second Lieut. Harold T. Brotherton,
 Second Lieut. Larkin W. Glazebrook,
 Second Lieut. Samuel D. Smoley,
 Second Lieut. Charles F. Neave,
 Second Lieut. Robert W. Wilson,
 Second Lieut. Donald H. Brown,
 Second Lieut. Ralph de P. Terrell,
 Second Lieut. Stephen B. Ives,
 Second Lieut. Robert F. Webb,
 Second Lieut. William G. Lusch,
 Second Lieut. Miller H. Pontius,
 Second Lieut. Fritz A. Nagel,
 Second Lieut. Adrian J. McDonald,
 Second Lieut. John E. Hartigan, and
 Second Lieut. John L. Handy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors.

Capt. Charles R. Castlen,
 Capt. Harry D. Offutt,
 Capt. George D. Chunn,
 Capt. Charles M. O'Connor, jr.,
 Capt. Augustus B. Jones,
 Capt. Raymond E. Scott,
 Capt. Rufus H. Hagood, jr.,
 Capt. Herman G. Maul,
 Capt. Frank H. Dixon,
 Capt. Robert Du R. Harden,
 Capt. Lloyd E. Tefft,
 Capt. David D. Hogan,
 Capt. William F. Rice,
 Capt. Edward A. Noyes,
 Capt. Charles W. Riley,
 Capt. Charles G. Sinclair,
 Capt. Charles G. Hutter,
 Capt. Frederick H. Petters,
 Capt. Charles S. Ketchum,
 Capt. Robert P. Williams,
 Capt. Edwin B. Maynard,
 Capt. Harvard C. Moore,
 Capt. Arden Freer,
 Capt. Paul A. Schule,
 Capt. John S. Gaul,
 Capt. Frank W. Wilson, and
 Capt. Bertram F. Duckwall.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Charles R. Castlen,
 First Lieut. Harry D. Offutt,
 First Lieut. George D. Chunn,
 First Lieut. Charles M. O'Connor, jr.,
 First Lieut. Augustus B. Jones,
 First Lieut. Raymond E. Scott,
 First Lieut. Rufus H. Hagood, jr.,
 First Lieut. Herman G. Maul,
 First Lieut. Frank H. Dixon,
 First Lieut. Robert Du R. Harden,
 First Lieut. Lloyd E. Tefft,
 First Lieut. David D. Hogan,
 First Lieut. William F. Rice,
 First Lieut. Edward A. Noyes,
 First Lieut. Charles W. Riley,
 First Lieut. Charles G. Sinclair,
 First Lieut. Charles G. Hutter,
 First Lieut. Frederick H. Petters,
 First Lieut. Clarence S. Ketchum,
 First Lieut. Robert P. Williams,
 First Lieut. Edwin B. Maynard,
 First Lieut. Harvard C. Moore,
 First Lieut. Arden Freer,
 First Lieut. Paul A. Schule,
 First Lieut. John S. Gaul, and
 First Lieut. Frank W. Wilson.

INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Elmer F. Wallender to be captain.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lemuel E. Lindsay to be a lieutenant.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Frank H. Luckel and

Ralph F. Wood,

Ensign Robert H. Maury to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors with the rank of commanders:

Robert E. Hoyt,

John F. Murphy,

Jesse W. Backus,

Clarence F. Ely,

Perceval S. Rossiter,

Harry A. Garrison,

Henry L. Dollard,

Earle P. Huff,

Harry R. Hermesesch, and

Harry L. Smith.

Assistant Civil Engineer David G. Copeland to be a civil engineer with the rank of lieutenant.

Carpenter Edgar S. Covey to be a chief carpenter.

Pay Clerk Walter A. Thomas to be a chief pay clerk.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns:

Charles C. Roberts,

Charles L. Allen,

Guy A. Walker,

Nicholas Kedinger,

Percy C. Becker,

Stockard R. Hickey,

Alfred E. Stulb,

Walter Hinton,

George B. Kessack,

Oscar Erickson,

John J. Bayer,

Oscar F. Bandura,

Guy McLaughlin,

Russell G. McNaughton,

Eduard G. Jahnke,

Otto Beran,

David J. Spahr,

William E. McClendon,

Fred S. Wade, and

John W. Collier.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns:

Enos Dahuff,

Delos A. Humphrey,

William J. Sharkey,

George H. Charter,

Edward Reavely,

Niels Andersen,

Howard C. Heald,

Robert S. Dunn,

Lawrence E. Myers,

Robert S. Smith, jr.,

John E. Hatch,

Frederick Shea,

Clarence J. Gale,

Albert Nashman,

Charles E. Olson,

Robert Martin, and

William S. Quesinberry.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns:

James C. White,

Edward Reynolds, jr., and

Henry O. Rea.

The following-named ensigns of the National Naval Volunteers to be ensigns:

Robert W. Rose,

Matthew L. Kelly, and

Freeman J. Condon.

Medical Inspector Frank L. Pleadwell to be a medical director with the rank of captain.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors with the rank of commander:

Charles E. Ryder,

Allen D. McLean, and

Frederick G. Abeken.

Pay Clerk Roy E. Barrett to be an assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign.

Carpenter Edgar S. Covey to be an assistant naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Joseph W. Osborn, Porterdale.

OKLAHOMA.

J. T. Holley, Stigler.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John H. Fahl, Auburn.

Watson B. Reisinger, Wrightsville.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 26), 1918.

POSTMASTER.

Roy F. Santner to be postmaster at Glen Elder, Kans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest and answerest prayer, our God and our Father, hear and answer our prayers, mingled with the prayers of our allies.

Our heroic sacrifices mingled with the heroic sacrifices of our allies, our patriotism mingled with the patriotism of our allies pours itself out in deeds of heroism and valor, in defense of human liberty.

Our tears and sobs mingle with the tears and sobs of our allies for the precious dead and dying, the wounded and mangled on the field of carnage.

These are our prayers which spring spontaneously and fervently from the heart in behalf of human rights.

Thou art the God of justice, mercy, and love; all our faith and confidence are centered in Thee. In this hour of supreme trial, forsake us not, we beseech Thee, in the name of the world's great Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORTING OF ILLNESS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for three minutes in which to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent for three minutes in which to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have asked for this time in order to have read at the desk a letter in regard to the illness and death of a sailor, statements having already been made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] in regard to the illness of soldiers and the reporting of such illness.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., March 20, 1918.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A friend of mine named Anderson Knowles enlisted in the Navy at Bremerton about eight months ago. He bought a \$50 liberty bond, took out \$5,000 worth of insurance, and sent all his spare money to his mother as long as he was stationed at Bremerton.

Quite a while ago he was sent East, and his mother heard nothing from him for many weeks. Finally she received a telegraphic notice of his death somewhere in Massachusetts from pneumonia, and word that his body would be sent to her. She does not know whether he was sick for a long or short time, and is in much distress.

I do not wish to publish any complaint, or, in fact, to make any complaint, but I have a boy at Bremerton likely to be sent away any day, and I should like to feel that should he be taken down by sickness I would be notified of his condition.

Yours, truly,

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the Members that I understand that the Army is undertaking to send notice to parents of the serious illness of their sons. This is in line with what the Reavis resolution sought to accomplish. It is right and proper. I sincerely hope that a similar policy may prevail in the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made several applications to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department to learn of the condition

of sailors in different parts of the world, and at no time have I failed to receive the information promptly, even though it was obtained by cable. I suggest to the gentleman—and I am in entire sympathy with the movement which he generously desires to make—that if he desires the information for any of his constituents he will ask the Bureau of Navigation to furnish the information, when I am sure it will be supplied cheerfully and readily. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman permit? If the parents of a sick sailor boy are not notified, certainly his Member in Congress can not be notified by the parents.

Mr. BUTLER. That may be true, but why does not the parent or some one interested in the parent apply to the Bureau of Navigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have had no notification of his illness, which is the very point.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish to state that my experience in getting information in relation to sick and deceased soldiers is the same as that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. A short time ago a young man of my district who had enlisted in the marines lost his life on one of our battleships at sea. I went to headquarters, and they did everything that could be done, not only the chief clerk but the officer in charge. At the Navy Department they took pains to send a wireless message, and furnished me with immediate information. I was not denied information in any way. And not only the officers themselves but also their secretaries took a personal interest in furnishing all possible information.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 9867. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF BILL (H. R. 9414).

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, on page 4104, where the section making appropriation for the bill that passed yesterday occurs, the motion was made—

That additional compensation granted by the provisions of this bill shall be paid out of the revenues of the Post Office Department.

I want to ask unanimous consent, before the bill is printed, to strike out the word "bill" and insert the word "act." That is the usual provision.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill that was passed yesterday that the word "bill" be changed to the word "act" in the connection stated by him. Without objection, the correction will be made, and the enrolling clerk will take notice.

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 1006).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Colorado yield to me in order to place a small privileged resolution before the House?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Colorado in a minute.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 289 (H. Rept. No. 416).

Resolved, That there shall be printed 1,000 additional copies of A Brief on the Adoption of a National Budget System for use in the House document room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, has consent been procured?

The SPEAKER. It does not take consent.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman if this resolution that is being presented is predicated upon any reasonable expectation that some action is to be had during the present session looking to the adoption of a budget system?

Mr. BARNHART. I am not authorized to speak as to that. It is a very feasible proposition. I can say, so far as I am concerned personally, that I would be in favor of taking up such a proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any objection to the resolution, but I call attention to the fact that this is Calendar Wednesday, and no business is in order except Calendar Wednesday business, unless that is dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will not insist on it if it takes only a short time, but—

Mr. McCORMICK. I hope the gentleman will not object. This matter interests all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is going to make a speech the Chair will rule this out of order.

Mr. WALSH. If you have got to act upon resolutions without information, I suppose a request for information is out of order.

The SPEAKER. Well, the rule is—

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman was attempting to answer a question that I propounded when this interruption came.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can answer the question. Mr. BARNHART. He had answered it before this interruption took place.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal request, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I ask a couple of weeks' leave of absence from the House, on account of the illness of myself.

I am, respectfully,

CALDER POWERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE WAR-RISK INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. RAYBURN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to make an inquiry of the Speaker. The Senate, on Senate joint resolution 133, refused to concur in the House amendments and asked for a conference. That is the resolution authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured. The House agreed to the conference. This morning we met, and when the House amendments were explained to the Senate committee they asked the privilege of going back to the Senate and moving that they rescind their action in asking for a conference, stating that they were going to move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. I do not know in what shape that leaves it.

The SPEAKER. That automatically kills the conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that ought to be laid down as a rule.

The SPEAKER. Did not the Senate agree to the House bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. What the gentleman from Texas reports is that they met in conference, and, without having made any report at all, the Senate conferees proposed to go back and recede from their position.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought they had gone back and receded.

Mr. SHERLEY. No. The papers are in the hands of the conferees, and not in the hands of either House, and there ought to be a report made by the conferees to the respective Houses.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was what I was going to ask. I do not know what the practice is in the premises.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, the House agreed to the conference report, and therefore the papers are in the possession of the House conferees.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Therefore it is necessary, as I see it, for the conferees on the part of the House to make a formal report.

The SPEAKER. But the House conferees can not make a report until they know what the Senate does.

Mr. SHERLEY. They can report a disagreement and have the conference ended in that way. But the Senate can not act,

not having the papers. It can not dispose of a conference simply on its own accord.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Senate has such rules that they can move to reconsider the matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the matter be allowed to go over until to-morrow.

FUEL ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I shall object to further speeches this morning.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we know on what topic?

Mr. KEATING. It is on the order of the Fuel Administration. Mr. McCORMICK. As it affects Colorado?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 the National Fuel Administration reduced the price of bituminous lump coal at the mine in Colorado 50 cents a ton, and announced that on April 1 there would be a further reduction of 70 cents a ton. Other varieties of coal were reduced in proportion. I was notified of the action of the Fuel Administration through the following letter from Mr. Harry D. Nims, assistant to Dr. Garfield:

UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION,
March 8, 1918.

Hon. EDWARD KEATING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KEATING: We have telegraphed to Colorado a new schedule of prices effective 7 a. m., March 11, 1918, as follows:

Bituminous domestic coal:	
Run of mine	\$2.25
Prepared sizes	3.50
Slack of screenings	1.25
Bituminous steam coal, Trinidad district:	
Run of mine	2.35
Prepared sizes	3.25
Slack of screenings	1.65
Lignite coal:	
Run of mine	2.25
Prepared sizes	3.25
Slack of screenings	1.00

The above prices are subject to the following summer reductions:

Bituminous domestic coal:	
Apr. 1	\$0.70
May 1	.50
June 1	.35
Aug. 1	.15
Bituminous steam coal, Trinidad district:	
Apr. 1	.40
May 1	.30
June 1	.20
July 1	.10

I hope this will meet your approval and that you will agree with us that it should iron out most of the difficulties which have been involved in the situation.

Very truly, yours,

UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION,
By HARRY D. NIMS.

The moment it became known that the Fuel Administration had ordered a reduction in the price of coal in Colorado the coal mine operators of that State began bombarding Congress and the Fuel Administration with telegrams of protest. They asserted that the reduction would close scores of mines and seriously curtail the output of the State. In fact, one earnest protestant went so far as to say that thousands of miners had already been dismissed and that the State's coal production had been cut in two.

These statements found their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, as I had urged the National Fuel Administration to cut the price of coal, I was naturally curious to ascertain just how much truth there was in these alarming stories. I wired to friends in Colorado asking for the facts, and received many replies. Among those I addressed was John A. Rush, a prominent attorney of Denver and the president of the Consumers' League of that city. This league was formed for the purpose of protecting the people against the exactions of the coal interests, and it has done much excellent work. As Mr. Rush was out of the city when my telegram reached Denver his law partner, Mr. Foster Cline, replied as follows:

John Lawson, John McLennon, the State mine inspector, and others say there are more coal miners now at work than ever before for the month of March. Some few mines are closed as usual for this time of the year because their coal can not be stored. Some smaller mines are short of orders because the consumers are waiting for lower prices on April 1.

John Lawson and John McLennon, referred to in the telegram, are leading officials of the miners' organization, and therefore in a position to know conditions at the various mines.

One of the leading newspaper men of Colorado wired me, denying the alarming reports circulated by the coal operators and concluding with the expressive, if not elegant, expression, "It is all bunk."

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to injure the coal-mining industry in Colorado or elsewhere, but it is just as well that gentlemen should understand that the coal consumers of this country have some rights which the Fuel Administration and the coal-mine owners are bound to respect. When Congress enacted the law which gave the President control over the coal mines of this country I am sure it was not our purpose to have that law administered exclusively in the interests of the men who own coal mines. If I understood the purpose of Congress, it was that the Fuel Administration should fix the price of coal at a figure which would insure every one engaged in the business a generous profit, but which at the same time would safeguard the public against extortion.

I think that was the thought that Dr. Garfield had in mind when he accepted the position of Fuel Administrator; but I am also convinced that at times he has been sadly imposed upon by representatives of the mine owners and that he has been led to issue orders which were not in the public interest.

In that connection Colorado's experience may prove illuminating. Some time in August last the President of the United States fixed the price of bituminous lump coal at the mine in Colorado at \$2.70 a ton. At that time the people of Colorado were complaining that the price of coal was unreasonably high. This complaint, by the way, was not confined to Colorado but was quite general throughout the Nation, and the justice of it was largely responsible for the passage of the bill placing coal mines under governmental control. The people of Colorado, in common with the people of the rest of the country, looked for relief through governmental regulation. You can therefore imagine their surprise when on the 1st of October, instead of reducing the price of coal, the National Fuel Administration issued an order advancing the price of bituminous lump coal from \$2.70, the figure fixed by the President, to \$4 a ton. This was done at the urgent solicitation of a committee of coal-mine owners which had been sent to Washington from Colorado. The coal consumers were given no chance to present their side of the case, and the first they knew of the decision was when it was announced in my home town—Pueblo, Colo.—that the retail price of lump coal, instead of being reduced, would be advanced 50 cents a ton.

I immediately began to receive protests by letter and telegram, and I suggested to the Fuel Administration that the order advancing the price of coal be suspended until such time as all the parties in interest could be heard. This was not done, but Mr. H. D. Nims, representing Dr. Garfield, assured me he would be glad to make an investigation. When he learned that I was about to leave for Colorado he suggested that I examine into the situation "from the consumer's point of view" and let him know the result.

I agreed to do this, and on my arrival in Colorado went to some trouble to get at the facts. I found that the city of Denver was operating a municipal coal yard, having been compelled to enter into the coal business because of the unreasonable prices charged by the coal dealers. The city purchased its coal from two independent coal operators and paid \$2.20 a ton for lump coal at the mine. The leading paper of Denver, the Post, was also in the coal business, and I found it was purchasing its coal from three different companies on the basis of \$2.10 a ton for lump coal at the mouth of the mine. Here were five companies selling lump coal at the mouth of the mine for \$2.10 and \$2.20 a ton and making money, while the National Fuel Administration was insisting that \$4 a ton was a reasonable price.

Mr. SLAYDEN. At the mine?

Mr. KEATING. At the mine.

Mr. SHERWOOD. For the same class of coal?

Mr. KEATING. In some cases.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman say it was the same class of coal?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. In some cases it was the same kind and in some cases not.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, the Fuel Administrator fixed \$4 a ton, and the dealers raised the price to the consumer 50 cents?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; the price—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given such time as he requires.

Mr. KEATING. It will require only a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I transmitted these and other facts to the Washington office of the Fuel Administrator, and urged that an investigation be made and that the price of coal be reduced.

The exactions of the coal interests aroused deep resentment among the people, and organizations were formed all over the State to assist in the fight for fair coal rates, but nothing definite was accomplished. Instead the President ordered an additional advance of 45 cents a ton to cover the cost of an increase of wages which he had authorized. There was little opposition to this, because the people felt the money was going to those who actually dug the coal, but they continued to insist that the original increase authorized by the Fuel Administration of \$1.30 a ton was without justification.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. During the confusion I did not hear the early part of the gentleman's remarks. Did I understand him aright that he contends that the people have some rights that the Fuel Administrator is bound to respect?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. Not only that, but I am trying to demonstrate that the Fuel Administration is recognizing the rights of the people.

When I returned to Washington in December I again presented the facts to the Fuel Administration, and after many conferences was told that the entire subject would be referred to a board made up of experienced coal men, who would go over the cost sheets of the coal companies and all other data which might be available. This board devoted much time to the work, and I am sure was in no sense unfriendly to the coal-mine owners. It was on the recommendation of this board that Dr. Garfield finally ordered the reduction in the price of coal in Colorado to which I have referred.

Therefore the reduction was not made hastily. It was not suggested by inexperienced men who had only an "academic" knowledge of the coal business. It was made after the people of Colorado had been compelled to pay exorbitant prices for a period of five months, and after the facts had been so clearly proven that they could no longer be controverted.

In support of this latter statement permit me to quote from a letter written to Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS, of Colorado, by Dr. Garfield on March 20, 1918. After stating that he had based his action in the Colorado case on a report submitted to him by a committee of engineers, consisting of Mr. Cyrus Garnsey, jr., Mr. R. V. Norris, and Mr. James H. Allport, all experienced coal men, Dr. Garfield writes:

I have examined the costs reported by 13 of the mines reported by Mr. Nash to have shut down; the sheets of the others, apparently, have not been turned in to the Federal Trade Commission. The costs reported reveal the fact that not in a single instance did the August costs reported by the mine exceed the price fixed. Indeed, the highest cost for August allowed a profit of 2 cents per ton and the lowest 80 cents per ton. In September two of these mines reported costs slightly in excess of the price fixed. In one case only was the cost excessively high, and that was of a mine which produced only 298 tons. This mine reported \$1.69 less cost per ton on a still smaller tonnage for August.

An examination of the costs available of these mines does not warrant the assumption that they have closed down because of inability to produce at a profit.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed) H. A. GARFIELD,
United States Fuel Administrator.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell me the highest price he knows of that any consumer paid for soft coal in Colorado?

Mr. KEATING. That would depend on the location. In the mountain districts it went very high.

Mr. SNYDER. About how high?

Mr. KEATING. In my own town, which is in the valley, it was \$7.25.

Mr. SNYDER. I just want to say that there are some consumers in the East who are now paying as high as \$4.50 at the mine.

Mr. KEATING. The situation in the East and the situation in the West are not at all alike. In the West we had no coal shortage worth mentioning. There it was entirely a question of price; and our contention was that the price charged by the coal-mine owners was unreasonable and extortionate.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman is quite right. I just asked for information, that is all.

Mr. KEATING. My only criticism of the Fuel Administration is that it was unreasonably slow in responding to the complaints of the coal consumers of Colorado; but, in explanation of the administration's conduct, it is only fair to state that Dr. Garfield and his lieutenants were so busy endeavoring to straighten out the coal situation in the Northern and Eastern States that they had little time to devote to Colorado's problems.

My object in making this statement to-day and in taking up the time of the House in this fashion is to indorse the order of the Fuel Administration and to express the hope that Dr. Garfield will not be influenced by the clamor of the profiteers. [Applause.]

When I returned from Colorado last December I submitted the following statement to the Fuel Administration at the request of Mr. Nims, Dr. Garfield's assistant:

DECEMBER 6, 1917,

Mr. H. D. NIMS,
United States Fuel Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NIMS: When I was leaving for Colorado early in October you asked me to report to you on the coal situation in that State "from the consumer's point of view." I endeavored to comply, and from the 14th to the 20th of October submitted to you by wire the results of investigations which I conducted in Denver, Pueblo, and other Colorado cities and towns.

Permit me to again summarize my findings, which I assure you can be supported by ample evidence:

COST OF COAL AT THE MINES.

President Wilson fixed the price of bituminous lump coal at the mines in Colorado at \$2.70 per ton. At the solicitation of the coal-mine owners, your office on October 4 advanced this price to \$4 per ton and, later on, the President added another 45 cents to cover a general advance in wages which he authorized. Corresponding advances were made in the Colorado lignite fields. I will not burden you with all the figures, as I know you have them in your office. For the purposes of this letter, I will deal with the price of bituminous lump, which is the coal used by the people of my home city—Pueblo, Colo.—but the argument which I will make for the reduction of the price of bituminous will apply with equal force to lignite, the coal largely used by the people of Denver and other northern Colorado towns.

In my judgment the Fuel Administration's action in advancing the price of bituminous lump from \$2.70 to \$4 was without justification and should be rescinded.

When this advance was ordered, and for weeks thereafter—or until the President directed the last advance of 45 cents per ton—the Denver Post was purchasing both lignite and bituminous lump at the mine for \$2.10 per ton and carrying on an extensive retail trade in the same in the city of Denver.

Mayor Robert W. Speer, of Denver, on behalf of the municipal coal yard, was purchasing lignite lump from three different companies for \$2.20 per ton and selling the same to the people.

Mayor Speer and the Post took practically the entire output of five coal mines at the prices indicated, and my information leads me to believe that the coal operators made a reasonable profit.

If five companies—operating under union conditions and without any material natural advantage—could afford to sell lump coal at the mine for \$2.10 and \$2.20, why was it necessary for the Fuel Administration to authorize an advance to \$4 a ton?

On April 1, 1917, all the retail coal dealers of Pueblo were purchasing bituminous lump at the mines for \$2.75 a ton, and the coal companies were prospering.

What occurred between April 1, 1917, and October 1, 1917, to justify an advance of \$1.25 a ton? I have endeavored to ascertain the facts and am convinced that 25 cents a ton would more than cover any increase in cost of production.

Bituminous lump should be reduced \$1 a ton at the mines and a similar cut should be made in lignite.

I have received a number of complaints from granges and other organizations which have been accustomed to buying coal in carload lots and distributing it among their members. They allege that since you issued your regulations, the dealers' combines have induced many of the coal companies to refuse to sell to them. Other citizens have had similar experiences.

I hope it will be possible for you to break up these combines and to restore free competition. There should be no question about the citizen's right to purchase at the mine in carload lots.

As I stated to you in my telegram of October 18, I am sure that an investigation will show that the consumers of Colorado are paying not less than \$1.50 a ton too much for their coal.

They have submitted to this extortion with marvelous patience, hoping that the National Fuel Administrator, exercising the ample powers vested in him by Congress, would eventually afford relief. That relief, if it is to be of value, must be granted at once. Already many of our citizens have purchased their winter's supply of coal. You can not return the money which has been unjustly taken from them, but you can protect the pocketbooks of the others.

Sincerely,

EDWARD KEATING.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order to-day under the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the attitude of the majority leader [Mr. KITCHIN] is on that question. I have not talked with him personally, but representing him here in his absence I think, from what understanding I have of the matter, I shall have to object to unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the proceedings in order to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I have five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman does not care to debate it, I do not care to do so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.

The question being taken, on a division, demanded by Mr. STAFFORD, there were—ayes 104, noes 24.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 47, not voting 85, as follows:

YEAS—299.

Alexander	Esch	Kreider	Rucker
Almon	Evans	La Follette	Russell
Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Larsen	Sanders, Ind.
Aswell	Fairfield	Lazaro	Sanders, La.
Austin	Farr	Lee, Cal.	Sanford
Ayres	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Saunders, Va.
Baer	Fields	Lehlbach	Scott, Iowa
Bankhead	Fisher	Leshner	Scott, Mich.
Barkley	Focht	Lever	Sears
Barnhart	Fordney	Little	Sells
Beakes	Foss	Lobeck	Shackleford
Bell	Foster	London	Shallenberger
Beshlin	Francis	Longworth	Sherwood
Black	Frear	Lundeen	Shouse
Bland	Freeman	Lunn	Sims
Boohar	French	McAndrews	Sinnott
Bowers	Fuller, Ill.	McClintic	Sisson
Brand	Gallagher	McCormick	Slayden
Britten	Garland	McFadden	Slomp
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Sloan
Browne	Glynn	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Buchanagh	Gordon	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Buchanan	Graham, Ill.	McLemore	Snook
Burroughs	Gray, Ala.	Madden	Stegall
Butler	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Steele
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hadley	Mapes	Steenerson
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Campbell, Pa.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler, Miss.	Hamlin	Mays	Sterling, Ill.
Cantrill	Hardy	Meeker	Stevenson
Caraway	Harrison, Va.	Montague	Stines
Carlisle	Haskell	Moon	Strong
Carter, Okla.	Hastings	Moore, Ind.	Sumners
Cary	Haugen	Morgan	Sweet
Chandler, Okla.	Hawley	Morin	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Mudd	Switzer
Clark, Pa.	Heaton	Neely	Tague
Claypool	Heflin	Nelson	Talbot
Cleary	Helm	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Helvering	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Hensley	Nolan	Temple
Connelly, Kans.	Hicks	Norton	Thompson
Cooper, Wis.	Hilliard	Oldfield	Tillman
Cox	Holland	Oliver, Ala.	Timberlake
Crago	Hood	Oliver, N. Y.	Towner
Cramton	Houston	Olney	Vare
Crisp	Howard	Osborne	Venable
Crosser	Huddleston	O'Shaunessy	Vestal
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Overstreet	Vinson
Dallinger	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Voigt
Dawson	Hutchinson	Park	Volstead
Davis	Igoe	Parker, N. Y.	Waldow
Decker	Ireland	Phelan	Walker
Dempsey	Jacoway	Polk	Walton
Dent	James	Porter	Wason
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Pou	Watkins
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Pratt	Watson, P. I.
Dill	Jones, Tex.	Purnell	Watson, Va.
Dillon	Jones, Va.	Quin	Weaver
Dixon	Juul	Ragsdale	Webb
Dominick	Kearns	Raker	Welling
Donovan	Keating	Ramsey	Welty
Doolittle	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	Whaley
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Wheeler
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	White, Ohio
Drane	Kettner	Reavis	Wilson, La.
Dunn	Key, Ohio	Reed	Wingo
Dupré	Kless, Pa.	Robinson	Wise
Dyer	Kincheloe	Rodenberg	Woods, Iowa
Eagan	King	Romjue	Woodyard
Eagle	Kinkaid	Rose	Young, N. Dak.
Elliott	Knutson	Rowe	Zihlman
Emerson	Kraus	Rubey	

NAYS—47.

Anthony	Elston	Langley	Sabath
Bacharach	Fuller, Mass.	Loneragan	Sherley
Burnett	Gallivan	Lufkin	Smith, C. B.
Cannon	Garner	Maher	Snyder
Connally, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Merritt	Stafford
Dale, N. Y.	Gillett	Paige	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Mass.	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Delaney	Greene, Vt.	Rainey	Walsh
Denison	Gregg	Rayburn	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Griffin	Riordan	Winslow
Doremus	Humphreys	Robbins	Young, Tex.
Edmonds	Husted	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—85.

Anderson	Church	Denton	Flynn
Blackmon	Classon	Dies	Gandy
Blanton	Cooper, Ohio	Drukker	Gard
Borland	Cooper, W. Va.	Ellsworth	Glass
Caldwell	Copley	Estopinal	Goodwin, N. C.
Carew	Costello	Fairchild, B. L.	Good
Carter, Mass.	Curry, Cal.	Fess	Goodall
Chandler, N. Y.	Davidson	Flood	Gould

Graham, Pa.	Lenroot	Platt	Sullivan
Griest	Linthicum	Powers	Templeton
Hamill	Littlepage	Price	Thomas
Harrison, Miss.	McArthur	Roberts	Tinkham
Hayes	McCulloch	Rouse	Van Dyke
Heintz	McKinley	Rowland	Ward
Hersey	Mann	Sanders, N. Y.	White, Mo.
Hollingsworth	Miller, Minn.	Schall	Williams
Johnson, S. Dak.	Miller, Wash.	Scott, Pa.	Wilson, Tex.
Kahn	Mondell	Scully	Wood, Ind.
Kehoe	Moore, Pa.	Siegel	Wright
Kennedy, R. I.	Mott	Small	
Kitchin	Overmyer	Smith, T. F.	
LaGuardia	Peters	Sterling, Pa.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BLANTON with Mr. McKINLEY.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.
 Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. FEEL.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. ROBERTS.
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. DENTON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GRAHAM.
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. GARD with Mr. HERSEY.
 Mr. GANDY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. McARTHUR.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ANDERSON.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (H. Rept. No. 417) from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 281.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the following bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for H. R. 7795:

"A bill to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers in spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes, or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each such farmer to use the seed thus to be obtained by him for the production of grain during the crop season of 1918. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450. All such advances or loans shall, as far as practicable, be made through the agency of State and National banks. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500,000, available immediately.

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to provide for and secure the voluntary mobilization and distribution of farm labor for the production and harvesting of agricultural crops for the year 1918, and to advance railroad fares and other actual traveling expenses for the transportation of such labor, upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as he shall pre-

scribe. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, available immediately.

"Sec. 3. That, in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor or any other Federal, State, county, or municipal department, agency, or officer, or with any person or with any association of farmers, board of trade, chamber of commerce, or similar organization.

"Sec. 4. That until the purposes of this act have been accomplished the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as soon as possible after the close of each calendar year, cause to be made to the Congress a detailed report showing all proceedings and transactions under this act during such calendar year. Such report shall, in addition to other matters, contain a statement of all persons employed, the salary or compensation of each, the aggregate amount of loans, advances, or sales, and the total amount thereof unpaid, and all receipts and disbursements under this act. All moneys collected by the United States under this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 5. That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"Sec. 6. That not exceeding \$100,000 of the moneys appropriated by this act may be expended for the payment of such administrative expenses, including such rent, the expense of such printing and publications, the purchase of such supplies and equipment, and the employment of such persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary for the purposes of this act."

Resolved further, That there shall be not exceeding two hours of general debate, the time to be controlled, one hour by Mr. LEVER and one hour by Mr. HAUGEN; that all debate shall be confined to the subject matter of the bill; that at the expiration of the general debate the committee substitute shall be read section by section for amendment under the five-minute rule; that at the conclusion of such reading the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the rule by striking out "two hours" and inserting "four hours."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not get the floor to make that motion.

Mr. WALSH. I have been recognized, I submit. I was asked why I rose.

Mr. FOSTER. Under all parliamentary rules the gentleman has no such right. I was on my feet just as the Clerk completed the reading of the rule.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman was on his feet, but not seeking recognition.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman was seeking it at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois had had recognition.

Mr. POUL. The motion is not in order.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman can not supersede me by getting up and "hollering" out in that way.

Mr. WALSH. It is necessary to "holler" out to obtain recognition from the Chair, and I received recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois already had recognition. The gentleman from Illinois had the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair rule that my motion is out of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the committee substitute for H. R. 7795, which is for furnishing of seed to farmers by the Government to increase the supply of food for the coming year. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, has just been called to the War Department, and he requests me to state for him that he is in favor of the rule and also for the bill.

Personally, I think this rule simply makes it in order for this House to consider another one of those radical measures that we have been accustomed to consider during the present session of Congress under the caption of war-emergency legislation. Last week when we were discussing the war finance corporation bill that measure was characterized, as I remember it, by both the leader of the minority and the majority as one of the most radical measures that had ever come before the House, and as a measure that would not receive a moment's consideration in time of peace. I believe this measure is even more radical than the war finance corporation bill, and goes further toward

committing the Federal Government to the policy of paternalism than any measure yet considered, and when we have once committed this Government to the principle of paternalism it is going to be mighty difficult to get away from it. Personally I am against this Government adopting that principle, but as long as we have adopted it, as far as big business is concerned, ship-building, public utilities, and the railroads, I do not believe we can consistently refuse to comply with the request from the farmers when their request is a moderate one, when we consider that they are conducting the most important business in this country at the present time, not only from our own standpoint, but from the standpoint of our allies. [Applause.] And if loaning them a small amount of money will in any way increase the food production during the present season, I think we are under obligations to do it, no matter how radical the measure may seem to be at the present time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think that this bill would accomplish the end more effectively if it were broadened so as to include other farm products?

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will wait a moment, I shall come to that.

Mr. SNYDER rose.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman would discuss the corn-seed problem.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. To the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had any particular deluge of requests from farmers in his district for this measure?

Mr. SNELL. Not a one, as far as seed is concerned, but many on subject of labor shortage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I want first to finish my statement, and then I will yield. I consider that when we adopt the provisions carried in this bill we are committing this Government to the wildest kind of wildcat banking, and I doubt if much of this money will ever be returned to the United States Treasury. But, on the other hand, if we are going to consider this legislation at all, it should be considered at this time, because if we wait a little longer it will not do any good to the farmer and not in any way help to increase the crop for 1918.

Now, just a moment on the provisions of the bill itself. Section 1 appropriates \$7,500,000 for relief of farmers in the spring-wheat areas of the United States. This, of course, to a large degree confines the relief to the Northwest. As I look at the whole bill, if it is good for the Northwest, it ought to be good for the Northeast; if it is a good thing for the State of Montana, it ought to be a good thing for the State of Maine; and, whether the people of my district have requested it or not, if it is the proper thing that this Government should loan \$450 to any individual farmer to buy seed in the spring, it is certainly a good thing to loan it to any farmer in any part of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. In just a minute. When the time comes I propose to offer an amendment to the bill making it applicable to any and every farmer in any and every part of the whole country. [Applause.] The second provision of this bill, in my judgment, is by far the better part of the bill and a step in the right direction. It appropriates \$2,500,000 for the mobilizing and distribution of farm labor, the only help the farmers, as a whole, need and the only part of the bill I am deeply interested in. As far as I have learned the needs of the farmers of the whole country, they are more in need of labor to help them put in a crop, cultivate and harvest it than they are in need of seed. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. In view of the gentleman's statement about not confining it to any particular area, why not include corn, timothy, and clover seed?

Mr. SNELL. It is perfectly agreeable to me, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not include clothes to the farmer?

Mr. SNELL. I represent an agricultural district. The people in my district are so busy they do not bother their Representative about matters unless they are important. I have received more letters from the farmers in my district in the last 60 days than in the previous 3 years of my service here, and every letter I have received has been along the lines of the shortage of farm labor, and, as far as I am able to learn, there

is almost an entire disappearance of farm labor in all rural parts of this country. You must remember the farmer can not compete in question of wages with the munition manufacturer, ship-builder, and contractor who is working for the Government on a cost-plus basis. In addition to this, you have taken during the last year over 200,000 of the best young men from the farms and put them in the Army; so it is up to us, if we want them to continue to furnish food supply for the world, to do something definite in the way of relief for the present labor shortage in rural communities. I am assured by the Labor Department here in Washington that there is plenty of labor in this country, but that it is simply a matter of distribution. Now, this bill provides \$2,500,000 for this distribution of farm labor, and I trust that the Agricultural Department will get to work at once and, if this labor is available, see that it is distributed where it is most needed. Thus they will be rendering a real aid to every farmer in every part of the country.

The President and Mr. Hoover are all the time appealing to the patriotism of the farmers to raise more food products. Their advertisements are in every newspaper and magazine in the country. The farmers do not need to be appealed to on the ground of patriotism. What they need is more actual man power to help put in the crop, cultivate, and harvest it. [Applause.] You must understand that it takes more than patriotism to hold a plow and follow a drag on the farm. They have got the patriotism, but they lack the man power. The second part of this bill to a certain extent provides for that man power, and for that reason I am in favor of the bill and I hope that the rule and bill will be approved by the Members of this House. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used eight minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with that portion of the bill which provides for the making of advances or loans for the purpose of purchasing of seeds I am not in sympathy. I have not been convinced from such study as I have had the opportunity to give the question that the exigency is such as to require this extremely radical legislation, but I may be mistaken about it; I know that a great number of my colleagues who have given much thought and attention to it feel that it is a necessary measure and for that reason I have not felt disposed to undertake to wage any very bitter fight upon the rule or upon the bill itself, but I did not wish it to go by without at least stating my attitude toward the matter, because I may want to refer to it in the future when other legislative matters shall arise here upon the floor of the House. I yield back whatever time I may have left.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, having the honor to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture that presents this bill I feel it my duty, having the opposition point of view, to present that point of view. I am opposed to this bill as being one of the most dangerous precedents that could ever be established by any legislative body on earth. I do not believe in the principle involved in the bill. I did not support it in the committee, and I shall not support it here. We need not try to deceive the country. We are now pretending to pass a bill appropriating \$7,500,000 to be given to the spring-wheat section of the country—three or four States. We are engaged in that important work in this House the last of March. April is the planting season, and you are holding out here, this great body of legislators, that we are going to get \$7,500,000 loaned to the individual farmers during the month of April when another legislative body must deal with this proposition and April will be passed before it can be reached, and you know it. You will never get any legislation in the first place—

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. No; I have but five minutes. In the next place, if you get the legislation, then this money is to be loaned by the Secretary of Agriculture, loan \$450 to an individual allotment, through the \$7,500,000 that you are giving. Where is your machinery that you are going to be able in a few days' time to make these loans to the individual farmer? You need not try to fool the country. You can not get the machinery together to do it, and every Member of this House knows it. Now, what is the proposition? One hundred and sixty-six thousand six hundred and sixty-six families will be entitled to the loan. Who is going to find those people and who is going to draw the contracts? You know it can not be done; it is a perfect impossibility. The Secretary of Agricul-

ture knew it. He is opposed to the legislation and so stated in the committee, and yet we engage in this foolish piece of conduct.

Now, another thing: Some four or five States up there are involved. I sympathize with those people who have had droughts. My State has had the most severe drought in its history, and yet they have not asked anything on this floor. Let Texas take care of Texas is my slogan. Let these States that have suffered these droughts exercise their ability to take care of the situation, if it is possible to do it, but not go on the principle of coming to the Federal Government and ask that the Secretary of Agriculture go out to Tom, Dick, and Harry and make these loans. And what is the security? That, in his judgment, he need not take any further security than a loan on the crop. And there, gentlemen of the House, you run into the proposition of separate and distinct laws in the several States involved. I presume that every State involved in this matter has its landlord-and-tenant statute. My State has. The landlord has preferential liens on all the crops grown, and nobody can get in under that lien. It is statutory. I understand that a great deal of this land is owned by absent landlords, and they have not sufficient confidence in their own land and in their own tenants to advance this seed with which to seed the land. Are you going to be engaged in the foolish proposition of advancing to various people when the landlords will not advance to them, and let him step in with the statutory lien that is prior to the lien of the Government, collect his debt, and let the Government stand the loss? That is what this bill does. It lets the absent landlord reap the reward upon the taxes of the American people, who must be called upon to contribute this \$7,500,000. And with these principles involved in the bill I can not give it my support.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am not so much interested in the feature of the bill that provides for the loan of money to farmers as I am for the part of the bill that provides for the purchase and reselling of the seed. I am not sure that I can support this bill in its present form, because I do not think we ought to take care of the spring-wheat area alone. In my State last year practically 75 per cent of the corn was frostbitten, and the question of seed corn in Indiana is a serious one to our people. They can not get it. I do not care so much about the loaning of the money with which to buy it as that the Government get it and sell it to the farmer.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman know that \$6,000,000 was appropriated to sell seed for cash to farmers in that country?

Mr. BLAND. Then why is there necessity for this bill at all?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no necessity for it at all, then.

Mr. BLAND. This bill—

Mr. HAUGEN. And I might add that a bill is to come in in the near future that will take care of the proposition the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLAND. I am confining my remarks to this bill. Unless it was amended to include corn for the Middle West, I think it would fail in its purpose very largely. If there is necessity for seed anywhere in the world, it is in the corn districts that were frostbitten last year. I do not see why the committee should overlook such an important proposition as this. If I have an opportunity I am going to offer an amendment to strike out the words "spring-wheat area," so that the bill will apply to all of the United States, and then insert the word "corn," because I think if there is any necessity for anything to be furnished it is for seed corn. Recently we had the food department of the State over here investigating this question, and the secretary told me they were having an awful time trying to locate seed corn. They tried to prevent the farmer from selling their good corn on the market, and were trying to get what they could saved for seed purposes. The price was so attractive that most of the good corn for seed was sold and no doubt consumed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the membership of the House voted erroneously a few minutes ago, under the impression that the Congress had not provided ample funds to purchase seed and resell it to the farmers in those districts of the country where there was a drought or where there were poor crops. In the bill that was signed by the Speaker this morning, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, \$4,000,000 was provided as a revolving fund to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, in addition to the \$2,500,000 that was provided last year, the very purposes which the gentleman

from Indiana and others have in mind to accommodate the farmers. But this bill goes further. This bill is a reflex—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill is a reflex of the opinions of the Nonpartisan League in securing radical and socialistic legislation in North Dakota. The legislature of that State in special session this spring authorized all the counties to advance money by loans to the respective farmers for the very purpose which is embodied in this bill. And this Congress now is emulating the socialistic principles of this Nonpartisan League for the first time, by establishing a policy of loaning money to farmers. Where will we stop?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] says we have a precedent in the action taken the other day in authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to loan money to various commercial and industrial activities. Why, the very warrant for that legislation was that the Federal reserve banks did not have authority, and that the Federal Reserve System would break down in making long-time loans.

If I had not had some experience with North Dakota in years back, during periods of excessive droughts, I would not to-day be so strongly in opposition to this measure; but I am somewhat acquainted with the conditions out there, and know the conditions when they have suffered successive droughts by reason of the Chinook winds coming from the south and blighting their crops. And yet in those days, when wheat was less than \$1, less than 75 cents, less than 50 cents, they were able to meet the conditions. And since then we have passed the Federal reserve act that brings relief to the farmers from the local banks for short-time loans, and we have passed the Federal farm-loan act that brings relief for long-time loans, and notwithstanding these, as a sop to this Nonpartisan League, at the instance of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], a bill is introduced in here, and Congress is asked to ratify the fundamental principles of this new socialistic party, which is running wild in the western prairie States and which has not the courage of its principles to announce that they are socialistic fundamentally.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. In the legislation that has already been passed on this question does the gentleman take the position that the spring-wheat field area has been taken care of as well as the corn question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say that the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations show that the Agricultural Department has been doing everything in its power to meet the drought conditions in the various parts of the country by furnishing at cost not only seed wheat but seed corn. The department has been doing everything, and the committee has just voted \$4,000,000 additional to the \$2,500,000, which it makes a revolving fund, whereby adequate means are furnished for that very purpose.

Mr. BLAND. For what purpose?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution making in order this proposed legislation is a very simple one. It is not the character of rule that I objected to a few days ago, under which the Post Office salary-increase bill was taken up. There are no riders or jokers introduced under this rule. It provides simply for the consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for the bill H. R. 7795, and the committee substitute, including the title and enacting clause to be considered, is set out fully in the rule. The rule does not provide for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7795.

The committee substitute that is to be before the House for consideration if this rule is adopted may be divided into two parts. The first part provides for an appropriation of \$7,500,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the production of wheat, oats, and barley in the spring-wheat growing areas of the United States. It is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture may make contracts with farmers to increase the production of wheat, oats, and barley and to advance them money for seed in connection with these contracts, or the Secretary may loan to farmers outright an amount not exceeding \$450 to each farmer, to enable him to secure seed to put in a crop and increase the production of wheat, oats, or barley.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, or would he rather not yield?

Mr. NORTON. Not just now. If this war has made clear anything, it has made clear the fact that agriculture and the production of foodstuffs is one of the things most essential to the success of our Nation and our allies in this war. If any of the industries are to be helped and encouraged by the Government during this war, agriculture is deserving of the first and highest consideration.

One of the questions which has arisen in the discussion of this bill is as to whether there is any necessity for this legislation, or whether it does not come too late. If there is necessity for it, I dare say there is not a single man in this House who will object to this legislation or who will oppose it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A married man may do it? [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. Well, I think, on the merits of the proposition, both the married men and the single men of the House will support it.

If there is a real necessity for this legislation—and I believe there is—if under the authority proposed to be granted by this bill to the Secretary of Agriculture it will enable him to give aid and encouragement to farmers in the spring-wheat growing areas of the United States to such an extent that a material increase will be made there this year in the production of wheat, oats, and barley; if, as it clearly appears, the enactment of this bill as drafted in the Committee on Agriculture is likely to result in an increased production this year of more than 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, the bill merits the support of every Member of the House interested in a sufficient supply next year of wheat for the people of our own Nation and for those of our allies in this great war. If, on the other hand, the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the aid to be extended by this proposed legislation comes too late or is not needed, then the appropriation of \$7,500,000 provided in the bill for seed will simply not be used and the money will remain in the Federal Treasury to be used for other purposes of the Government. By the terms of the bill it is left wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to make contracts with farmers for increased production of wheat, oats, and barley or to advance or loan them money to secure seed, so that they may sow and produce this year a greater amount of these grains than, without such aid, they otherwise would be able to do.

The second and most important part of the bill provides for the mobilization of farm labor and the distribution of it to different sections of the country where it may be most needed. An appropriation of \$2,500,000 is proposed for this purpose. Surely everyone who knows anything about how the attraction of new war industries and high wages in the cities has depleted farm labor in many sections of the country will give his support to this feature of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I should like very much to yield to my friend, but I have but a few minutes of time—not enough even to permit me to conclude my own reasons why this rule should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the principle of this bill. It may be that this bill will need amending. It may be that it is not broad enough to cover all sections of the country. But the amount of money appropriated will not go very far. It will not wreck this Government. We are daily appropriating money here to carry on the war of the ages. We are here to-day asked to appropriate some money to produce foodstuffs to feed the men, and we are told, "This is revolutionary; this is unprecedented."

My friends, within a year we appropriated \$800,000,000 for aeroplanes. I wonder if anybody thinks we are going to get any of it back? Of course it is unprecedented. Of course nothing was ever done before of the kind, nor did you ever see upon the floor of this House a bill to furnish money to munition factories, to shipbuilders, to railroads, until now.

Mr. Speaker, there is a class of people that need financial help just now. Let me speak to you about my own State, because I know more about my own State than I do of other sections of the country. Our people are a wheat-growing people, largely in all eastern Montana. They have settled that country within the last few years. Last year there were 20,000 homestead entries made in the State of Montana and the year before probably as many. There are 60,000 land entries in Montana to which people have no title yet. There is nothing that they can

give as security to any bank or financial institution, because they have no title to the land. Six years ago we raised about 5,000,000 bushels of wheat in Montana. Five years ago we raised about 12,000,000 bushels. Three years ago we raised about 18,000,000 bushels. Two years ago we raised about 25,000,000 bushels. Last year we had a failure of crops for the first time. If we had raised what we planted we would have raised 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. Our people lost their crops last year. They borrowed from every bank and financial institution all that they would lend them for the purpose of putting in seed, but they now have no finances; they have no title to the lands. The entryman who has not yet secured title can not go to his merchant or banker and obtain a loan, because he has no security to offer.

He can not go to his banker or to his merchant and borrow anything, because he has no title to his land. There are at least 60,000 of these men in the State of Montana, and every other Western State is to a greater or less degree in the same situation.

Mr. BUTLER. Will we be in time to help these people make a wheat crop if we pass this bill promptly?

Mr. EVANS. I think we will, but not if the bill suffers from the usual inertia of Congress. This bill has been before the Agricultural Committee for two months. It should have been acted on long ago. I introduced a similar bill last fall in the hope that it might be passed before this, but the inertia of Congress is almost beyond belief.

Mr. SWITZER. How late do they plant spring wheat in Montana?

Mr. EVANS. Probably until the 1st of May.

Mr. SEARS. Does the gentleman remember that it took the Federal farm-loan banks more than a year to get started before they could pass on titles and make loans?

Mr. EVANS. I suppose it did, but in this case there is no title to pass upon, except the mortgage on the man's crop.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How late can they seed barley in Montana?

Mr. EVANS. I do not know. I should say all through the month of April and part of the month of May.

Mr. FOSTER. Gentlemen say that this action is unprecedented. Yes; but we have done things during this war and during this Congress that were unheard of before, and that no one of us would do in time of peace; but when it comes to doing something to help the farmer increase the food supply of the country the farmer is entitled to consideration. This action is unprecedented, of course, but we ought to give it fair consideration.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I think it unnecessary for me to say that under ordinary circumstances I would be the last man in this body to support a proposition of this kind. I recognize that it is carrying paternalism almost to the breaking point, and I am not a paternalist in my political or economic views. But our country is at war, and in the successful prosecution of this war bread is proving itself to be as important as cannon, munitions, bullets, and the like. [Applause.] We can not afford, because of any squeamishness, to take the risk of reducing the bread supply of this Nation. When I say the bread supply I have in mind especially the wheat-bread supply.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman believe—

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield. It came to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture that in certain sections of the United States, notably in North Dakota, South Dakota, portions of Montana and Minnesota, the so-called spring-wheat area of the United States, they had suffered during the last year from a rather severe drought. It was argued to the committee with great force that in certain sections of that country many homesteaders were without means to buy wheat seed. It was argued that with proper encouragement from the Government, with a sufficient amount of seed for the purpose, the spring-wheat acreage of the United States could be increased three or three and one-half million acres during the 1918 crop year. If the yield from that acreage should be normal, it would add anywhere from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels of wheat to the wheat supply of this country. That amount may be critical. I have been very much encouraged at the sowing of winter wheat. The figures show that we have in already one of the largest crops of winter wheat that has ever been sown in this country. For quite a little while the reports as to the condition of the winter wheat were anything but encouraging. I am very happy to tell the House that reports received within the past few days from reliable sources convince me that there is nothing in the situation at this time, so far as the winter wheat is concerned, to give us any alarm. On the contrary, the situation is quite encouraging. If we should

have a normal production of wheat from the winter-wheat area, we should increase the amount of wheat in this country during this crop year. But we can not afford to take any chances. We ought, if possible, to sow this year in spring wheat not less than 23,000,000 acres. If we can do that and no unfortunate accidents happen because of unfavorable weather, or something of that kind, we should be able to harvest in the neighborhood of a billion bushels of wheat this year. We shall need between 850,000,000 and 900,000,000 bushels of wheat if we are to supply our own civilian population, our armies, and the armies and navies of our allies, and the civilian population of our allies. If there is any one thing that this country can not afford to neglect, if there is any one thing that this Congress can not afford to neglect, if there is any one thing the overlooking of which would be fatal to the successful prosecution of this war, it is the proposition of wheat bread.

You say, "Why wheat bread?" For the reason that wheat flour is practically the only material out of which you can make Army bread. You say, "Why not feed our allies with corn bread?" The answer is that probably 99 per cent of the bread consumed by our allies is baked in bakeries. More than that, the populations of our allies know nothing of corn bread. They have never been taught to use it. They are a wheat-bread-eating people, and we have got to recognize that if we want to deal with the situation intelligently.

There is another proposition in this bill which I think ought to challenge the attention of this Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I have received complaint after complaint about the farm-labor situation throughout the country, regardless of section or location. I presume every Member of Congress has received these complaints. I confess that I have no patent upon the solution of that problem. I think the Government is doing something that is going to help the situation somewhat. We are providing in this bill a fund of \$2,500,000 in the hope that the Department of Agriculture may find some way out of this difficult labor situation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the resolution.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH), there were—ayes 97, noes 15.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 279, nays 40, not voting 112, as follows:

YEAS—279.

Alexander	Crago	Fuller, Ill.	King
Ashbrook	Cramton	Garland	Kinkaid
Aswell	Crisp	Glynn	Knutson
Austin	Crosser	Godwin, N. C.	Kraus
Ayres	Currie, Mich.	Graham, Ill.	Kreider
Bacharach	Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	La Follette
Baer	Dallinger	Gray, N. J.	Langley
Bankhead	Darrow	Gregg	Larsen
Barkley	Davis	Hadley	Lea, Cal.
Barnhart	Decker	Hamilton, Mich.	Lehlbach
Beakes	Delaney	Hamlin	Lever
Bell	Dempsey	Hardy	Little
Beshlin	Denison	Harrison, Va.	London
Bland	Dent	Haskell	Longworth
Blanton	Dewalt	Hastings	Lufkin
Booher	Dickinson	Haugen	Lundeen
Bowers	Dill	Hawley	Lunn
Brand	Dillon	Hayden	McAndrews
Britten	Dominick	Heaton	McArthur
Brodbeck	Donovan	Heflin	McCormick
Browne	Dooling	Helm	McFadden
Browning	Doolittle	Helvering	McKenzie
Burnett	Doughton	Hensley	McKeown
Burrroughs	Dowell	Hicks	McLaughlin, Mich.
Butler	Drane	Hilliard	McLaughlin, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Dupré	Holland	McLemore
Byrnes, Tenn.	Dyer	Hood	Madden
Campbell, Pa.	Eagan	Houston	Magee
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Howard	Maher
Cantrill	Edmonds	Huddleston	Mansfield
Caraway	Elliott	Hull, Tenn.	Mapes
Carlin	Emerson	Hutchinson	Martin
Carter, Mass.	Esch	Igoe	Mason
Carter, Okla.	Evans	Ireland	Mays
Cary	Fairchild, G. W.	Jacoway	Mondell
Chandler, Okla.	Fairfield	James	Montague
Church	Farr	Johnson, Ky.	Moon
Clark, Fla.	Fields	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan
Clark, Pa.	Fisher	Jones, Tex.	Morin
Claypool	Focht	Juhl	Neely
Cleary	Fordney	Kearns	Nelson
Coady	Foster	Keating	Nicholls, S. C.
Collier	Francis	Kelly, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.
Connelly, Kans.	Frear	Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan
Cooper, Wis.	Freeman	Kettner	Norton
Cox	French	Kless, Pa.	Oldfield

Oliver, Ala.	Rose	Snook
Oliver, N. Y.	Rowe	Steagali
Olney	Rubey	Stedman
Osborne	Rucker	Steenerson
O'Shaunessy	Russell	Stephens, Nebr.
Overstreet	Sanders, Ind.	Sterling, Ill.
Padgett	Sanders, La.	Stinnes
Park	Sanford	Summers
Polk	Scott, Iowa	Sweet
Pou	Scott, Mich.	Swift
Pratt	Sears	Switzer
Purnell	Sells	Tague
Quin	Shackleford	Talbot
Raker	Shallenberger	Taylor, Ark.
Ramsey	Shouse	Taylor, Colo.
Ramseyer	Sims	Temple
Randall	Sinnott	Thompson
Rankin	Slayden	Tillman
Reavis	Slomp	Timberlake
Reed	Sloan	Townner
Robbins	Small	Vare
Robinson	Smith, Idaho	Venable
Rodenberg	Smith, Mich.	Vestal
Romjue	Snell	Vinson

NAYS—40.

Almon	Gallivan	Merritt	Sabath
Anthony	Garner	Moore, Ind.	Sherley
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Paige	Sisson
Buchanan	Gillett	Parker, N. J.	Stafford
Cannon	Gordon	Phelan	Stephens, Miss.
Connally, Tex.	Greene, Mass.	Platt	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Vt.	Ragsdale	Treadway
Elston	Husted	Rayburn	Walsh
Fuller, Mass.	Kincheloe	Riordan	Wright
Gallagher	Leshner	Rogers	Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—112.

Anderson	Foss	Key, Ohio	Rouse
Blackmon	Gandy	Kitchin	Rowland
Borland	Gard	La Guardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tex.	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Caldwell	Glass	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Campbell, Kans.	Good	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Goodall	Linthicum	Scully
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodwin, Ark.	Littlepage	Sherwood
Classon	Gould	Lobeck	Siegel
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Loneragan	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, W. Va.	Green, Iowa	McClintic	Smith, T. F.
Copley	Griest	McCulloch	Snyder
Costello	Griffin	McKinley	Steele
Curry, Cal.	Hamill	Mann	Sterling, Pa.
Davidson	Hamilton, N. Y.	Meeker	Stevenson
Denton	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Minn.	Strong
Dies	Hayes	Miller, Wash.	Sullivan
Dixon	Heintz	Moore, Pa.	Templeton
Doremus	Hersey	Mott	Thomas
Drukker	Hollingsworth	Mudd	Tinkham
Dunn	Hull, Iowa	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Ellsworth	Humphreys	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Ward
Fairchild, B. L.	Jones, Va.	Porter	Webb
Ferris	Kahn	Powers	Welty
Fess	Kehoe	Price	White, Me.
Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey	Williams
Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Wood, Ind.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. DIXON with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. VOIGT.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. WHITE of Maine.

Mr. WELTY with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay" on the first call of the roll, but I understand the bill is to be broadened so as to make it more equitable, and I want to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The House will automatically resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7795, with Mr. POU in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the substitute for House bill 7795, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7795) to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri reported the bill and is in a position to advise the House what it contains, and I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill which is reported to you to-day from the Committee on Agriculture has had very earnest and serious consideration by that committee. It might not be out of place for just a moment if I were to give you some of its history. It was first referred to a subcommittee. That subcommittee went over it very carefully, revised it, rewrote it, and reported it back to the full committee. Even then the full committee was not satisfied. The bill went to another subcommittee, was again rewritten and re-drafted from the beginning to end, considered from every viewpoint, and that subcommittee reported the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Agriculture presents this bill which is before you to-day. In that connection permit me to say that we had extensive hearings in regard to the subject matter contained in the bill. There came before our committee a number of gentlemen from the Northwest and from other sections of the country who presented to us the facts and needs of the communities to which this bill applies. Now, I want to call your attention to the further fact that this bill presented here to-day is a workable measure. I want to call your attention to the fact that this bill has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the statement as made upon the floor of the House to-day that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this measure. He is not opposed to it; he is in favor of the proposition. I hold in my hand a letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture was called away about the time this bill was reported. He was attending a series of war conferences which were being held in the South under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. I have here a letter from the Assistant Secretary to Mr. Houston from which I want to quote just a few words. I will not take up the time of the committee to quote it all. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Harrison, says:

I have called his attention to the bill (H. R. 7795) which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture on March 8. I have received word from him that he believes the plan proposed would be workable, and that he favors the new measure and urges its immediate passage.

Now, I am quoting from the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is where he stands upon this proposition. I will here insert the correspondence for the information of the House:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 20, 1918.

DEAR GOV. RUBEY: I take pleasure in sending you herewith a copy of a letter which I have just written to Mr. LEVER regarding H. R. 7795.

Very truly, yours,

F. R. HARRISON,

Assistant to the Secretary.

HON. THOMAS L. RUBEY,
House of Representatives.

MARCH 20, 1918.

DEAR MR. LEVER: As you know, when the Secretary recently appeared before the Committee on Agriculture he stated that he would be sympathetic with any plan that could be devised and operated on a business basis for assisting farmers in the spring-wheat areas who are unable to secure credit for the purchase of seed. The Secretary, as you know, is attending a series of war conferences which are being held in the South under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. I have called his attention to the bill (H. R. 7795) which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture on March 8, and I have received word from him that he believes the plan proposed would be workable, and also that he favors the new measure and urges its immediate passage. Of course, if the bill is to be passed, it should be passed immediately. On account of the lateness of the season it is impossible to say just how much money can be advantageously utilized in carrying out the provisions of the bill or to what extent relief can be furnished. It seems desirable, however, to provide the full amount, especially in view of the fact that whatever is not required will remain in the Treasury.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

F. R. HARRISON,

Assistant to the Secretary.

HON. A. F. LEVER,
House of Representatives.

Here is another thing: It has been stated upon the floor of this House that this bill is not workable; that if we pass it, it can not be put into effect. Let me say to you that the Department of Agriculture is getting ready to put this bill into operation. It has made an investigation of the State laws between tenants and landowners in every State to which this bill is applicable. All the blanks—the blank forms and agreements and everything of that sort which will be used when this bill goes into operation—are being formulated, and the Department of Agriculture will be ready to put this measure into operation immediately; just as soon as it passes this House and the Senate and becomes a law. I make that statement now to show you that the Department of Agriculture wants this measure and is getting ready to put it into operation. If you pass it and give the opportunity it will be put into operation at once. In every State in the northwest country we have the agents of the Department of Agriculture and we have the boards of national defense; we have the banks; and this bill provides that they may utilize both the State and the National banks to get the information in order to put this measure into operation.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee this: This morning some gentleman raised the question that this bill applied only to the spring-wheat area of the country. Will the gentleman tell the committee why his committee limited it to that area?

Mr. RUBEY. As every Member of this House must know, we can not always grant what each individual Member wants. There were some members of that committee—I was one of them—who wanted it extended to the entire country, but a majority of the committee in its wisdom confined it to the spring-wheat area for the reason that that was the only part of the country that we could reach at this late day.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman stated the purpose of this bill was to grow wheat so we could feed our allies with wheat bread. Now, if that is true, why are oats and barley included in this bill?

Mr. RUBEY. For this reason, we want to raise all the foodstuff we can. We want to raise everything that will help in raising foodstuff that is possible, and we are told that there is some land in that section of the country where they can raise barley, some land where they can raise oats, new ground where they can raise oats the first year and where you can not raise wheat the first year. That is the reason we were willing to extend the provision so that we could raise all the foodstuff and feed possible.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The gentleman regards corn bread as good food, and there is plenty of time yet to plant corn?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not like to take the gentleman's time—

Mr. RUBEY. I will have to answer one at a time; I can not answer both at once.

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I thought he had finished.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but it strikes me, knowing something about farming, that if the Government is to furnish seed for wheat alone that the farmer will be induced, perhaps, to sow wheat instead of oats or barley.

Mr. RUBEY. That question can be discussed, I will say to the gentleman, better by those who come from that section of the country and who will speak for it and possibly answer that question better than I can.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RUBEY. For a question.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Of course, the gentleman knows that corn is as much a substitute for wheat as barley. Now, in the great corn belts of the country, by reason of the premature frosts of last year, seed corn that is good is selling at \$20 a bushel. Why did not the committee include corn as well as barley?

Mr. RUBEY. I answered the question when I stated a moment ago that the committee decided after mature deliberation that the best thing to do in order to get the bill through this House and get it through quickly was to bring in a bill that would apply to the spring-wheat area, and for the further reason that we want the wheat to feed the soldiers.

It has been stated here to-day that this bill is unprecedented, that this matter of furnishing seed to the farmers on credit, and so forth, is something that we have never done before. I want to say to the gentlemen of this House, and if you will think for

a moment you will remember it, that we passed through this House last May the bill H. R. 4188—I think it was the latter part of May—known as the food-survey bill to assist and stimulate production. That bill had in it a provision appropriating several million dollars and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish seed corn, seed wheat, and every kind of seed for the farmer, and as that bill passed this House it contained a provision in it that this seed should be furnished to the farmers on credit. That bill was voted upon by you gentlemen here on the floor of this House. I do not know how many voted for it or how many voted against it, but it passed this House about the 25th of May last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. I will take five minutes more. I have control of the time in the absence of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RUBEY. I can not yield. I have only five minutes, and I want to call your attention to the provisions of that bill. The bill to which I have referred and which was passed last May appropriated several million dollars, and the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to purchase, grow, or to otherwise secure such seed, and store them and furnish them by sale to farmers on credit or on other terms at cost, including the expense of packing and transportation. Now, this House voted for that proposition. This House said to the people of this country that we were going to furnish the farmers of the country seed, and were going to furnish them seed on credit, and that is what we are asking you to do to-day. In this hour, when we need to produce wheat and other crops, we come here and ask that the Congress of the United States do everything in its power to see that every acre of land is put into cultivation, to see to it that the farmers produce just as much as possible, to the end that we may have the foodstuff necessary for our armies and to carry on this war.

I must not take further time, Mr. Chairman; there are other Members of the House who desire to speak, but I want to urge upon the membership of this House that they vote for this bill for another reason. The second section of this bill appropriates \$2,500,000 to help out the farm-labor situation, and we all know that the question of farm labor is the most serious one confronting our farmers to-day. Let us pass this bill to-day, and enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, to mobilize the farm labor of this country, transport it to the places where it is needed, and give the farmers relief along that line. I am sure this is something in which we all are very deeply interested. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, the bill carries \$7,500,000 for the purchase and distribution of seed, \$2,500,000 for voluntary mobilization of farm labor. I believe we all agree that there is need for foodstuffs, especially wheat. We had a short crop of wheat last year, probably less than 600,000,000 bushels, and when we consider the world's limited shipping facilities and loss and danger from the black rust and drought, it is up to us to encourage this production. We are expected to supply a large portion of the world with foodstuffs, and there is urgent need of increasing production. I trust that this bill will pass and that we may get through with it this afternoon.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman think that the committee has been very generous in providing for the expense of the mobilization of farm labor \$2,500,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think we all appreciate that if we are going to increase the production it is necessary to provide the farmers with farm labor.

Mr. HAMLIN. You are not going to pay these laborers for their work?

Mr. HAUGEN. We are going to pay the transportation and whatever expenses the Secretary may determine.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman does not think it will take \$2,000,000, or even one-tenth part of it, to pay the transportation, does he?

Mr. HAUGEN. That depends on how extensively the Secretary goes into the scheme.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think \$2,500,000 would pay about all the farm laborers in the wheat-growing sections of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. If \$2,500,000 is not needed, it will not be expended.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is not there enough wheat in the spring-wheat States for seed purposes that may be purchased?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is possibly plenty of wheat. There is no question about that; that is, for seed, but there is a question whether we will have enough wheat for seed and food, too. We may have to substitute other cereals for the wheat.

Now, as to the wheat situation, it is this: Our yield for 1917 was probably less than 600,000,000 bushels, though the department estimated 668,000,000 bushels. Compare that with the yield for 1915—1,025,801,000 bushels—and you will see the shortage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thought the committee had investigated and found that the farmers could get seed wheat, but they could not get credit through the banks to purchase the wheat.

Mr. HAUGEN. The purpose of this bill is to supply the homesteaders and other people in the spring-wheat area, who have not money to purchase their wheat. There are other sections in this country where there is as much need of seed as in that section of the country, but they have money and credit, and do not need this legislation. What we are now trying to do is to supply the people without seed and without credit. We propose to take chances in loaning this small amount to the farmer in that section of the country where crops are uncertain. In other words, if he will take the chances on planting and harvesting, we propose to take a chance on loaning him the money to buy seed with up to the amount of \$450.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think where those conditions exist we can well afford to do so. The other day we appropriated \$50,000,000 to house the workmen in our shipbuilding plants. The laboring men of this country must be fed, and their Representatives on this floor can well afford to appropriate this money to provide the food with which to feed them.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is but a drop in the bucket compared with the total annual appropriation.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, while the roll calls indicate that there is some opposition to this bill, up to this time only two gentlemen have spoken against it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] opposes it on principle, because it is proposed to sell seed on time; but if I am not mistaken, he voted last year for the bill H. R. 4188, which passed this House, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell millions of dollars' worth of seed on time. And on this side I am glad to see that there is only one gentleman who has talked against it, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and he happens to be a gentleman who does not know from what direction the Chinook winds come. He seems to be obsessed with the idea that the Chinook winds come from the south, while everybody knows, at least those in the West know, that they come from the west. They get the name because there is a tribe of Chinook Indians near the mouth of the Columbia River, and the warm winds come east along the river. Again, these winds come in the winter, and not in the summer, as the gentleman seems to think.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] also claims that this bill is without precedent. It is the first time, so he says, that the Government has ever undertaken to loan money to farmers for seed or otherwise. The State of South Dakota, or at least the Territory before it became a State, passed such a law something like 35 years ago, and did business under it. The State of North Dakota has a law that is over a quarter of a century old under which seed has at different times been sold to the farmers under terms similar to those proposed in this bill. The State Safety Commission in Michigan has purchased, as I understand it, a couple of million dollars' worth of farm machinery to sell to the farmers on time this very year, and the corresponding commission in the State of Wisconsin is spending a large sum of money to sell various kinds of farm machinery to the farmers on time.

A year ago we passed in this House what is known as the bill H. R. 4188, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, grow, or otherwise procure seed grain, to store same, and to furnish same by sale to farmers on credit.

Now, we passed that bill in this House last year. It was changed in the Senate to read "for cash"; but, so far as this House is concerned—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; I regret to say I can not yield, because my time is so limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But, so far as this House is concerned, we went on record for the bill authorizing the Secretary to sell seed on time.

Another objection raised is to the inclusion in this bill of oats. In the State of Montana it is known that many of the farmers will want to raise a crop on new breaking. Wheat will not grow on new breaking, but oats will, and it is better to have oats grow on the land than no crop at all. Besides, it will get

the virgin sod ready for a wheat crop in 1919; and it is not inconceivable that this war will continue throughout next year. Prairie land seeded in oats this year will be ready next year for seeding to wheat.

I was glad to hear the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture, who has heretofore withheld his approval, has decided to indorse this bill. The Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover, is strongly in favor of it. He indorsed it before the committee and he has indorsed it since, and he has called attention to the very great need for its passage in order to increase food production.

The food-conservation campaign of Mr. Hoover has been a great success, but that does not remove the necessity for increased food production. Mr. Hoover was himself one of the first to point out that fact. When Roumania fell into the hands of the central powers they captured 1,400,000 tons of cereal grains, and it is believed that very large quantities of foodstuffs have come into the possession and control of the central powers from Russia. That is an added reason why it is necessary for us to increase the food production in the United States.

It is not proposed, as some think, to make a gift of the seed to farmers. The bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers to grow wheat, barley, or oats and advance a part of the cost in the shape of seed grain at a reasonable price. If the bill is passed it will bring about a substantial increase in grain production—perhaps 40,000,000 bushels—and will tend to reduce the cost of living. The labor feature of the bill will also greatly increase agricultural production. Some seem to think that we may have too great a production—too much wheat, too much barley, too much oats, and so forth. Yes; and we may get too many bullets, too many guns, and too much ammunition if the war ends suddenly, which will, much of it, be little better than junk after the war is over. Gentlemen, it is high time to get down to business. Let us quit using smooth phrases such as "food will win the war." Instead, let us say in tones loud enough to be heard all over the United States, that bread, barley, beefsteak, bacon, and beans will win the war, and then boost it along by passing this bill quickly and by putting it into operation without delay.

If the wheat acreage is decreased this year no one should jump at the conclusion that it is by reason of a lack of patriotism upon the part of grain growers. There may be causes beyond their control. Some of these reasons will be:

First. If this bill is not passed quickly many of them will be without seed.

Second. Many of the farmers are short of feed because of the high price and other reasons. This will mean that they can not get the usual amount of work out of their horses, their work will be delayed, and it will be necessary for them to seed coarse grains or none at all.

Third. The shortage of labor will have the same effect. It will retard the seeding.

With an almost certain decrease in the wheat acreage in sight, is it not the part of statesmanship to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for the growing of 3,000,000 acres of wheat which would otherwise grow to weeds?

The problem of securing farm labor is causing our farmers much concern. They are wondering if they put in the seed whether they can secure help to harvest the crop. Five hundred thousand men have gone from the farms to the Army and Navy. More than that many have gone from the farms into the war industries. While other much more ambitious schemes were being talked of to obtain labor for the farms we concluded to report an item in this bill of \$2,500,000 to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in mobilizing farm labor upon the voluntary basis. All the big employers of labor in the United States find it necessary to furnish railway transportation to obtain and keep up their working forces. How can the Secretary of Agriculture hope to compete for men against such corporations if we do not arm him in the same way?

Mr. Chairman, with the great cause of humanity hanging in the balance, with the health and even the life of our American public involved, we should speed the passage of this meritorious bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to have permission to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the lady from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to talk to you a few minutes about the conditions in Montana; not that I wish to interest you in the farmers in one part of the country more than in another, but so that you may know the details of the wheat situation.

Within the last 10 years Montana has changed from a grazing State to an agricultural State. But the farmers are new. They have taken up homesteads. There are still about 60,000 farmers who are in the homestead stage. Others have just "proved up." The business men—the merchants and the bankers—are new. They are not guided by an approved knowledge of the business integrity of their patrons, as in most other parts of the country; they are giving their credit on faith—faith in the country, and faith in the men with whom they deal, and faith in the possibilities of a good crop.

Our farming is different from that of other sections of the country, in that we have not diversified farming. Wheat, alternating with other grains, is the specialized crop. We have all the difficulties of a new country; great distances of the farms—50 or 75 or 100 miles—from the railroads.

But in spite of these difficulties our production of wheat has been remarkable. In 1910 Montana produced 7,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1911, 10,000,000 bushels; in 1912, 12,000,000 bushels; in 1913, 20,000,000 bushels; in 1914, 18,000,000 bushels; in 1915, 42,000,000 bushels. That was the banner year all over the country. In 1916 we produced 30,000,000 bushels. Last year, in the drought year, we produced 18,000,000 bushels.

These figures mean more, when they are compared with other States, when you realize that in 1916 Montana produced almost a third as much wheat as the State of Kansas, which is the largest wheat-growing State in the Union, Montana producing 30,000,000 bushels and Kansas 98,000,000 bushels. We produced more wheat than the State of Minnesota and more than the State of Pennsylvania, and almost as much as the State of Oklahoma. Last year, in a drought year—and you can see from the figures given that last year was the only year we had a drought—we produced 18,000,000, while North Dakota produced only 39,000,000 bushels. Nobody doubts that North Dakota is a wheat State, a State that grows wheat successfully. Yet even in our drought last year we produced almost half as much wheat as North Dakota, and more than the State of Michigan, and more than the State of Virginia, and more than the State of Texas.

Last year the farmers all over the State wanted to put in war crops. They borrowed money far beyond what their judgment dictated. The bankers and the stores gave credit, more credit than they ever gave before, and then there was no crop. Now the bankers and the merchants can not give credit because they have not the credit themselves. The farmers have not even a title to the land. The title still belongs to the Government.

The State has recognized the seriousness of the situation. An extraordinary session of the legislature was called and bills were passed making it possible for the counties to use \$10,000 in the purchase of seed wheat. In counties where \$10,000 would not be enough they made it possible for the counties to bond themselves for the proper amount. In some of the counties they have already held elections. One county telegraphed me that their returns were 934 to 30 votes in favor of bonding the county.

But this bonding is only possible so long as they stay within the constitutional limit of the authorized total indebtedness. The wheat counties are new counties and are already bonded almost to their constitutional limit of indebtedness. These counties can not meet the situation. They can not furnish the necessary amount of seed wheat even by bonding to the total indebtedness provided by the Constitution, and they must have Federal aid.

These counties have their land in perfect condition to plant the wheat, because last year they had no crop and there was no harvesting, and no hauling of the crop to the market. So they devoted their energies to putting the ground in condition for the spring planting. But they have no credit. There is no way in which they can get the credit, not even with all that the State can do. There are about 15 of these new counties that need aid from the Federal Government, and they must have it if we are to have wheat from those counties next fall. I urge the passage of this bill that we may have wheat to win this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we are involved in war. Without regard to the views we may have entertained as to the propriety of entering the conflict, it is now too late to debate the question. As patriotic Americans, we must stand as one in front of the advancing foe. While all, I am sure, are hoping and praying for the dawn of the day that will bring an end to the ugly struggle, I am wondering if the people realize the seriousness of the situation. We are engaged in a mighty conflict; on its result depends the happiness of mankind. If the forces of democracy win, this world will move forward with the same rapid stride that has witnessed its progress during the past century. The peoples of the world will be free to determine their own destiny. If we lose, the clock of time will be set back and the iron heel of military despotism will dominate for many troubled centuries. Our brave boys—your sons and mine, and the sons of our friends—are going forth to sacrifice their lives in the holy cause, the cause of liberty. They are willing to die that liberty may live. I would to God that some one might rise, who could speak in a voice that would awaken the Nation and arouse it to a sense of its imperative duty. A great world tragedy is in progress beyond the sea. Congress has done its duty. With practical unanimity and without political division it has responded instantly to every request from the President, and placed without restraint under his control the wealth of the Nation. Into his hands it has given more power than that hitherto possessed by any man. If the sentinel on the watch tower is unable to report "All is well," the blame can not be laid at the door of Congress. In the future there will be no hesitancy in granting whatever authority is needed to successfully and vigorously prosecute the war.

We are engaged in an undertaking that will tax all our resources and demand undreamed sacrifices on the part of all. The quicker the Nation awakens to a realization of this dreadful truth the sooner we will be able to put the whole unhappy affair behind us. There must be no division in our ranks now. The time for united and energetic action is here. This can only be accomplished if all classes of our citizenship are convinced that there has been no discrimination in the distribution of burdens. Every person, every item of property, every dollar of wealth must be made to bear its just portion of the sacrifice. In no other manner can the voices of discord be hushed. Perfection can not be attained, but we should spare no effort to approximate it. The contribution by a citizen, safe in his home, of all his property is not comparable to the sacrifices of the brave lads who will surrender their lives in the struggle. In the presence of such sacrifice it is regrettable that any of us are capable of thinking in terms of profit and loss. As no one is being asked to give all his wealth, it behooves us to see that everyone contributes in the ratio of his ability. When another revenue act is prepared, profiteers must come through. Industries accumulating vast riches from war contracts must be made to pay. Eighty-five cents of every dollar of war profits is collected by Britain to pay the expenses of her war. There is no reason why profiteers here should not receive the same treatment. The war should not be a period of profiteering. Capital should be given a fair return sufficient to stimulate production and maintain itself. The same fair profit should go to the working man and the farmer; all should fare alike. If this is done, all will be well; if not, the inequality will sooner or later plague us.

In normal times this bill would not be proposed. It is brought before the House with the favorable recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture because we are living in unusual times and laboring under extraordinary and unprecedented conditions. All admit that it is of supreme importance that sufficient food for the armies and peoples of our own and allied countries be produced. In this connection I invite attention to the conflicting views expressed by the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration on the food situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture says we have an abundance of food to satisfy present and future needs. The Food Administration proclaims "meatless and wheatless days," requires the use of flour substitutes, commands us to keep the hens, to increase pork production, to increase wheat production, warns us there is a great shortage and we and our allies are facing starvation. I agree and disagree with both. There is no danger of immediate starvation. I am not, however, so optimistic about production. It is idle to boast at this time of an abundant future supply. It is not the part of wisdom to dodge unwelcome facts. We are engaged in a monstrous undertaking and should prepare for it. Food is as indispensable for our success as bullets and men. It is folly to arm, equip, and send our boys across the sea without food. It is foolish to spend billions on transports if there is no food to carry. It is idle to hunt down submarines if there is

no food to destroy. Food is vital. With an abundance the war will be won; without, the fight is lost. Wheatless and meatless days and the elimination of waste will help, but will not prove a substitute for decreased production. An abnormal demand can not be supplied by a normal yield. It can be satisfied only by supernormal production. The problem is to increase production. The people are told food will win the war. It is therefore pertinent to inquire, What has been done to insure such supply?

The American farmer is a man of ordinary intelligence. He realizes during these years of war every business engaged in manufacturing war materials has grown enormously wealthy by reason of the war. He knows that no restrictions have been placed upon them. He knows what we all know, that there is a shortage in the food supply of the world. He knows that several causes have contributed to this shortage; that it has come about in part by scant production in the warring countries, but more largely because of lack of transportation to make available the yield in Australia, India, and Siberia. He knows that the world's need presents an opportunity to reap a rich reward of good prices for his products. The prospect for that reward was sufficient incentive to stir the farmers of the Nation to unparalleled activity, and it had that effect. They were willing to risk the prices they would receive for what they grew.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that the wheat producer is not complaining so much of the fixing of the price of wheat as he is of the fact that the prices of other articles that enter into the cost of wheat producing are not fixed?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the gentleman from Kansas is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. AYRES. It is a fact that the wheat producer would be perfectly willing to have the price of wheat fixed if the prices of other articles that enter into the cost of the production of wheat were also fixed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that is correct. So far as I know, the farmer is not complaining of the prices fixed on his products, but he is complaining because the prices of other commodities have not been fixed in comparison with his prices.

Without suggestion from him, prices have been fixed on a part of what the farmer grows, but he is left to the tender mercy of the profiteer when he comes to purchase. Naturally this has produced much complaint, and the farmer has gradually become convinced that he is being treated unjustly. I am surprised that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administration do not realize such feelings prevail. Whether there is reason for it is beside the question. We are concerned about the fact. If such a feeling exists, it means less effort on the farmer's part and a correspondingly decreased yield. This should not be permitted, if avoidable, in these perilous times. The farmer had many lean years before the war and feels that he is entitled to sufficient profit now to care for those losses. He knows that when this war ends, guaranteed prices end also, and henceforth his product will go on the market in competition, not only with the product of the world but also with the unlocked supply now accumulating in Australia, India, and Siberia. He feels that when he is producing at a profit during these war times, it is not fair to select his product alone and fix a price on it without considering his prewar losses, and the situation he will face after the war, when forced to compete with the hoarded surplus of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORGAN. My colleague is one of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, perhaps the most important committee in Congress in the interest of the farmer. I know that he has been of great service to the farmers not only of his own State but of the Nation in that capacity. Inasmuch as it does not seem fashionable for some reason to equalize the prices of the things which the farmer has to buy, does not the gentleman in his position as a member of this committee think it would be proper, if we can not equalize these other prices, to raise the price of wheat a little?

Mr. THOMPSON. As far as I am concerned, I am in favor of raising the price of wheat to \$2.50 a bushel.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think the price of other products ought to be fixed the same as that of wheat, and if the price of other products is not fixed, should the price of wheat be fixed?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Kansas I will say that the farmers are not complaining about \$2 wheat. The complaint that they make is that the price of their product is fixed, while the prices of the articles

which they are compelled to purchase are not fixed. They are perfectly willing to accept any price that is fixed on their products, if the prices of all other articles are fixed at the same time, but they do not think it is right to fix the price of their product and let the profiteer get whatever he can, according to the law of supply and demand on every other product. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a matter of selfishness with the farmer, or with me, or with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], or with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who injected a question into this debate, or with anybody else in this House. I am sure we all want to win this war. That is what we are interested in. If we win this war we must have a sufficient amount of food to supply our forces in Europe. Unless you take care of the farmer you will not get a sufficient amount of food to supply the boys who are fighting our battles on the front.

Mr. AYRES. Another question, if the gentleman will yield. Is it not true that consumers have been advised to use substitutes for flour, such as corn meal and other things that have advanced anywhere from a cent to a cent and a half a pound above flour?

Mr. THOMPSON. A little later on in my speech, if I have the time, I will be glad to touch upon that, because they advise us to use corn meal, oatmeal, rye, and other substitutes. Now, the only man who gets any advantage in this price-fixing matter is the man over in Europe to whom we loan money to buy our food supply. He takes our money and comes back over here and buys our wheat. The price of wheat is fixed, but the prices of rye, oats, barley, and other wheat substitutes are not fixed. Therefore the man who produces wheat in this country has got to go to the store and purchase these substitutes at greatly increased prices. He does not get the benefit of this decreased price of wheat.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield for a moment right there?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Among the things which enter into the cost of wheat production are the sacks in which the wheat crop is carried to market. Those sacks are brought from Calcutta, and the price of Calcutta sacks for this year's wheat crop will be about 32 cents apiece.

Mr. THOMPSON. The gentleman is absolutely right in his statement. The farmer in this country gets no benefit from the fixing of the price of wheat. That is what I am trying to impress in these few remarks I am making here. Now, I have got to hurry along.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the usual price of sacks is about 8 or 10 cents to the farmers of America.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the gentleman for the information. Our soil is rich, our farmers are patriotic, but the soil will not yield unless seeded and cultivated. Farmers are ordinary men, and will seed and harvest those crops that yield the most profitable returns. They tell us it is wheat and pork that are most needed to win the war. The question then is, How can their production be stimulated? The answer is easy—make their production profitable. Their production must not only be profitable, but it must be more profitable than the production of substitutes. One dollar and ninety cents for wheat and 15½ cents for pork under normal conditions would enrich the farmers and result in increased production; not so now. According to the Department of Agriculture it requires 13½ bushels of corn to produce 100 pounds of pork. Corn costs in my district from \$1.75 to \$2 per bushel. The farmers can not produce pork from this high-priced corn except at the cost of bankruptcy. If he purchases the feed, he is loser from \$8 to \$12 on every hundred pounds; if he produces the corn, there is more profit in selling it. This condition has resulted in the wholesale shipment and slaughter of immature hogs, and a totally paralyzed industry in my State. The Oklahoma Council of National Defense has just completed a live-stock census and found seven sows to every nine farms in the State. It found the same alarming condition was true of other meat-producing animals. The farmers write me the cost of feed is so high that they have been compelled to dispose of their herds. This may account for an abundance of pork now, but it does not indicate a future supply. The farmer can not produce meat at the price fixed without loss. If he is blessed with a bank account, he may engage in the pleasant pastime, but it is certain he can not operate on borrowed capital, because banks do not make advances to finance losing enterprises. The farmers say the price on articles they purchase—farm machinery, farm wages, and supplies have advanced to such a point that prices fixed on wheat and pork are not profitable. They write

me that disk harrows that sold for \$21 when wheat brought 97 cents now sell for \$75; a three-and-a-quarter wagon that sold in 1916 for \$80 now costs \$175; harness that cost \$35 then, now sell for \$80 and \$90; a 7-foot binder with fixtures cost wholesale f. o. b. Chicago in 1915, \$120.50, now \$203; a 12-foot harvester with attachments cost f. o. b. Chicago in 1915, \$210, now costs \$395. In 1915 a three-bottom tractor-engine plow cost, wholesale, \$80; the manufacturer now demands \$186. The farmers advise me they sell their wheat at a fixed price, but there is no limit when they purchase the same wheat in manufactured form. I have investigated the matter. On January 28 I addressed a letter to Hon. J. M. Aydelotte, chairman Oklahoma State Council of Defense and chairman of the board of public affairs of my State, which does all the purchasing for the State's activities, and who, prior to accepting this position, was for 25 years one of the State's most prominent and active dealers in grain and grain products, a man of high character and recognized ability. Here is what he said:

Answering your favor of January 28, in reference to the food situation and the recent food law enacted fixing the price on raw products, wheat mainly. Now, they can not regulate conditions when the raw-product price is fixed only. If the department will authorize the fixing of the price of the finished product, then something can be done. Consequently the farmers are suffering, also the consumer of food, as well as the consumer of concentrated feeds for stock.

Dr. Brooks, the food administrator for the State of Oklahoma, has no jurisdiction over the milling interests. They are selling through jobbers and brokers and not complying with the law; that is, a great many of them. The price of bran, shorts, and by-products of wheat are being sold at enormously high prices compared to the price paid for wheat. The corn prices have not yet been fixed. The grain men and millers have filled up their storage capacity and now are raising the price.

I have been manufacturing various kinds of feeds for 20 years before I accepted this position with the State, and I well know that no one can control food conditions as long as they only fix the price of the raw material.

I have a letter from a farmer, who tells me that he has been compelled to pay \$52.40 per ton for bran; that he had his hogs on feed, and this was the only way that he could market them; that the price he paid not only wiped out all his profits, destroyed his work, but that he lost about 50 per cent of the money invested. There is no excuse for such a price for bran while the farmer receives only \$1.90 for his wheat. Fifty-two dollars and forty cents a ton for bran is 100 per cent in excess of the price he ought to pay if the price for his wheat were carried through the transaction. Farm labor, I am informed, can hardly be obtained at any price. Day laborers are charging from \$3.50 to \$5; farm hands paid by the month are charging from \$60 to \$100, and this includes their board. Two years ago they could be obtained from \$25 to \$40 per month. The farmers do not object to price fixing if it is applied to all articles, those they purchase as well as those they sell. What they object to is being singled out and saddled with the whole burden of the war. They are willing to bear their part, but they do not want to pull the whole load. The food bill passed a year ago was not a price-fixing bill; Congress was not asked to enact such a law. When that bill passed it was intended to destroy speculation and profiteering, and in that way increase the price to the farmer and reduce the cost to the consumer.

Here is what Mr. Hoover said in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on June 19 last with reference to the bill:

From a number of current illusions about the legislation proposed, the first is the illusion in some quarters that the bill is directed against the producer. It would not be necessary to traverse this statement to anyone that had read the bill. It especially excepts the producer from every one of its provisions, with the exception of one section, and that is the provision for a guaranty, and this section is designed to entirely benefit and secure the producer. The savings of the American consumer ought not and should not be made by a sacrifice on the part of the producer. They should be made by the exclusion of speculative profits from the handling of our foodstuffs.

In the same hearing, and to show the effect of excluding speculative profits between the producer and the consumer Mr. Hoover gave as illustration the price for bread to the consumers in Belgium, France, and England. He said:

Practically the entire wheat supply to Belgium is to-day imported from the United States, and despite the extraordinary costs of transportation the price of bread is 60 per cent of the price in New York City. A large portion of the wheat of France comes from this country, and yet the price of bread is, again, 40 per cent below our own. In England, where food control was started too late, the price is 30 per cent below our price, and in Canada, again, we see a lower range of prices to the consumer than in our own country, although the producer realizes the same price.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] if he will grant me a little more time.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. THOMPSON. About 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I regret exceedingly that every minute is taken of my time.

Mr. RUBEY. All of my time and more, too, is spoken for.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I can not get an extension of time, because I think this is the most important bill that we are considering during this entire Congress. Here we are talking about billions and spending hundreds of billions—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Millions.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, hundreds of billions; and when it comes to taking care of the farmer we can not spend 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman realize the rule provides for only two hours of general debate, and that the effort of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to extend the time to four hours is ruled out of order?

Mr. THOMPSON. I voted to extend the time, and I would be glad to have the time.

The farmers must be relied upon to increase production. They are dissatisfied. They do not feel they have received fair treatment. Under these circumstances increased production can hardly be expected. There should have been universal price fixing or no price fixing. The Food Administrator has the same authority to fix prices on corn and farm implements as on wheat and pork. Why has he not done so? I tried to find out. For that purpose I addressed a letter to both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administrator. The one addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture reads:

Section 1 of the act of August 10, 1917, commonly called the "food bill," defines the word "necessaries" as embracing foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

Section 5 of the same act authorized the President, from time to time, whenever he found it essential, to license "the importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities."

Under these provisions of the food bill the price of the 1917 wheat crop and the price of meat was fixed. The bill did not confer specific authority to fix the price of any article.

The Food Administrator licensed the elevators. One of the provisions of the license was that no more than a specified price should be paid for wheat. If the elevator violated that regulation, its license was revoked and it went out of business.

The Food Administrator also licensed the packing houses, and one of the regulations of the license was that a price not exceeding 15¢ cents per pound should be paid for hogs. If the packer paid more, his packing house was closed.

The farmers of the country have not complained at this exercise of authority in fixing the price of their products—wheat and meat.

They have wondered, however, why the authority to fix the price on "tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuel" has not been exercised and the price of these articles fixed so that they can continue to produce wheat and raise hogs without becoming bankrupt.

Harness, plows, mowers, wagons, farm labor—practically everything required for the production of wheat and hogs—has increased in price from 200 to 300 and in some cases 400 per cent. The farmer has had the price of his products fixed, but he has been compelled to pay two, three, and four times the normal price of everything he used in making possible that production.

The President pointed out this injustice to the farmer in his address to the Congress delivered December 4 last. He said:

"The farmers, for example, complain with a great deal of justice that while the regulations of food prices restrict their incomes no restraints are placed on the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase."

At this time when an increased production is so necessary and when your department is appealing to the farmer to increase the production do you not think it would be wise to remove this just complaint by fixing a fair price on those articles required for the actual production of foods and feeds and which the farmers are compelled to purchase?

I am convinced that no other action you could take would quite so hearten the farmers and stimulate them to increased effort.

If price fixing on farm products is continued and the farmer is left to the tender mercies of the profiteer in his purchases, I greatly fear it will result in discouragement and the consequent reduction of production of farm products.

I take it for granted that the authority conferred in the food bill is ample, if exercised, to take care of the situation I have described. Otherwise, I feel sure you would have already suggested to Congress the necessity of conferring additional authority. Congress has always stood ready to give you all the authority necessary, and had additional power been requested it would have been granted for the asking.

In conclusion, may I ask if the farmers can hope for any relief from the extortionate prices they have been and are being compelled to pay for "tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

I will thank you for the courtesy of an early reply.

Though the letter was written on the 23d day of February, the Secretary has not yet replied. For that reason I am unable to state the Secretary's position on the matter of price fixing.

A letter dated January 31 of this year, addressed to Mr. Ed Hockaday, Kingfisher, Okla., and signed by Arnold P. Yerkes, assistant agriculturist, I presume represents the views of the department. It reads:

Your letter of January 1, addressed to Mr. Victor Murdock, care Federal Trade Commission, has been referred to this office for reply. However, the question of prices for farm machinery is one over which this department has no jurisdiction whatever.

You, of course, realize that the price of raw material is only one item which is involved in figuring the cost of producing any machine. The cost of labor is also a large item, and this has increased tremendously. The price for fuel and other supplies necessary have also increased greatly. It is not meant by this to defend the prices which you mention, but merely to call your attention to the fact that it is not fair to judge the cost of production by the cost of raw materials.

On the whole, while farm machinery has advanced tremendously during the past few years, it has not increased proportionately with the price which the farmer is receiving for his products. This you can easily prove to your own satisfaction by taking the price of any of the staple farm products for the past three or four years and figuring the number of bushels of corn or other crops it required to purchase any machine. To-day it actually takes fewer bushels of corn or wheat to purchase a plow, corn planter, or any other machine than it did three years ago, or, in fact, for several years past. Looking at the matter from this standpoint, the prices do not seem out of proportion. However, if you still feel that some other action is necessary in the matter, it is the writer's opinion that you should take it up with the legislators, for, as above stated, this department has no authority in the matter.

I judge from this letter that the Department of Agriculture believes that the prices which the farmer is compelled to pay is not out of proportion to the prices he receives.

On the same day I addressed a letter to Mr. Hoover. I said:

Section 1 of the act of August 10, 1917, commonly called the "food bill," defines the word "necessaries" as embracing "foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

Section 5 of the same act authorized the President from time to time, whenever he found it essential, to "license importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities."

Under these provisions of the food bill the price of the 1917 wheat crop and the price of meat was fixed. The bill did not specifically authorize the fixing of the price of any article.

The Food Administrator licensed the elevators, and one of the provisions of the license was that the elevator should not pay more than a fixed price for wheat. If the elevator violated that regulation its license was revoked and it was no longer in business.

The Food Administrator licensed the packing houses, and one of the regulations was that not exceeding 15¢ cents per pound should be paid for swine. If the packer paid more than 15¢ cents for hogs his packing establishment was closed.

The farmers of the country have not complained at this exercise of authority in fixing the price on two of their products—wheat and pork. They have wondered, however, why a price has not been fixed on the manufactured products of their wheat—shorts and bran—and why a price has not been fixed on corn and its products—meal, etc.—and why a price has not been fixed on oats and rye and barley.

The Food Administrator has the same authority to fix a price on these products as he had to fix a price on wheat and pork. Prices on these articles could have been fixed in the same way. The failure to fix prices on these products has resulted in my State in practically the complete destruction of the live-stock industry. Bran is selling to the farmer at \$52.40 per ton. The farmer is paying from \$1.75 to \$2 per bushel for corn. Feeding 13 bushels of \$2 corn to produce 100 pounds of pork and selling that pork at 15¢ cents per pound is not a very profitable business, and the same is true of feeding \$52.40 per ton bran.

The food bill confers ample authority to protect the farmer from the conscienceless greed of a lot of profiteers. I am convinced that one of two courses must be pursued. The law of supply and demand must be permitted to control and govern when applied to what the farmer sells if it is to be applied to what the farmer is required to purchase.

May I ask, in conclusion, if any action is contemplated looking to the fixing of prices on what the farmer is compelled to purchase?

Will you be kind enough to reply at your earliest convenience?

To this letter Mr. Hoover replied under date of February 26:

I have your letter of February 23, 1918. I believe that you have somewhat misunderstood the power conferred by the food-control act in regard to the fixing of prices and the method by which the price of wheat has been stabilized.

The food-control act does not authorize the fixing of a price even by regulations issued under the license system. No regulation has ever been issued prescribing the price which elevators must pay for wheat, nor has any license ever been revoked because of the price paid for wheat. The result accomplished was made possible only because of the power to purchase wheat and to enter into voluntary agreements conferred by the food-control act.

In regard to hogs, no regulations have been issued forbidding the packers to pay more than 15¢ cents per pound, nor has any packing establishment ever been closed because of the payment of a higher price. The price of hogs has, in fact, averaged more than 16¢ cents per pound during the past three months.

I inclose herewith a pamphlet showing what has been done in the matter of hogs in order to assist the producer.

You will see from this explanation that the Food Administrator has no authority to stabilize the price of corn and other grains. I can scarcely believe that the price of corn is as high as \$2, for the average price paid at country stations in Nebraska, for instance, during the last week has been \$1.10 to \$1.30 per bushel.

In regard to the price of bran, our chief difficulty has been to prevent the jobbers and retailers from running up the price to meet the very high prices of other feeds. As you know, we have required all mills to sell bran at not more than 38 per cent of the price paid by them for wheat, and I inclose a copy of the regulations governing feed dealers which have been recently issued. I have sent a special agent to Oklahoma and the Southwest to investigate the numerous complaints regarding the price of bran, and I am very hopeful that we will be able to enforce strictly the regulations as drawn. We are somewhat handicapped in this matter by the absence of control over retailers, who are specifically excepted by section 5 of the food-control act from the license provisions.

If the licensing section does not give him that power, what does the last paragraph of his letter mean? He says:

We are somewhat handicapped in this matter by the absence of control over retailers, who are specifically excepted by section 5 of the food-control act from the license provisions.

The food bill conferred no authority on Mr. Hoover to fix prices. However, he has exercised the authority with reference to certain products desired for over-sea shipment—wheat, sugar, and pork—and it was done not only by virtue of authority conferred by the licensing section but by reason of the fact that he became the purchasing agent for our over-sea allies. It does not make any difference to the farmer whether the price was

fixed by virtue of authority conferred in the bill or by manipulation outside of the bill's provisions. The fact is he has been compelled to accept prices for his product that makes it unprofitable to continue its production. Mr. Hoover does not desire to fix the price of other articles than those I have mentioned. Here is an interview he gave out on the 25th of February to counteract the effect of a published statement that the Government might set maximum prices on all the farmer's products. He said:

There appears to be a good deal of misinformation circulated among the agricultural communities as to the policy and scope of the Food Administrator with relation to price fixing.

I wish to say at once, and emphatically, that the Food Administration is not a price-fixing body, except with regard to certain commodities which are to-day dominated by wholly abnormal over-seas commercial relations and the surrounding factors with regard to which are such as to project great dangers both against the farming community and at the same time the consuming community.

The two commodities under regulations are sugar and wheat. With the further exception of cases in which it has intervened purely as a friendly intermediary between organized producers and consumers, the Food Administration has no authority and no desire to fix prices on the products of agriculture.

This interview discloses Mr. Hoover is aware the farmers are not satisfied with price fixing. It was intended to reassure them, so there would be no decrease in their activities. It will perhaps have that effect as applied to every farm product except wheat and pork. It is likely to have the opposite effect on these two articles—the most necessary of all. When the farmer comes to plant he will take into consideration two things: First, that wheat substitutes—corn, oats, rye, and barley—are not controlled by fixed prices; and, second, that they command a price which will make their production more profitable than the production of wheat.

The farmer is as patriotic as any of us; he is ready to do his part. A few weeks ago the national Red Cross officers sent down word that Oklahoma would be expected to furnish 190,000 Red Cross members in the great drive in the week before Christmas. When the smoke had cleared away, it was found that more than 750,000 had been enrolled. This is not only four times the number expected, but it is the largest number in proportion to the population that was returned by any State. The farmers of Oklahoma did it. There was a great and almost unflinching response in the towns and cities, too, but listen to this from one of the head officials in charge of the membership campaign:

The farmers of Oklahoma responded even more nobly than the city people. There was a greater membership rolled up in the country than in the cities in proportion to their relative population. Many whole country townships furnished as many members as there were people in the township, and everywhere in the country there was general enthusiasm and interest in the great campaign, which means so much for the relief of the war sufferers.

I congratulate the farmers of Oklahoma. The fact is, the farm folks did just what they always do when there is a worthy cause that is properly put before them.

Farm, Stock, and Home, an agricultural paper published at Minneapolis, Minn., having a circulation of 140,000, principally in spring wheat growing States—Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana—has compared the value per acre at prices prevailing February 16, 1918, at Minneapolis, taking the average pre-10-year period yield. The average yield with present value per acre is:

Wheat, 11.9 bushels.....	\$23.80
Oats, 28 bushels.....	24.77
Flax, 8.7 bushels.....	32.80
Barley, 21.7 bushels.....	36.32
Rye, 16.9 bushels.....	37.18
Corn, 28.4 bushels.....	49.70

The farmers will be guided when they come to sow by the profits promised by different wheat substitutes. The result will be a decreased wheat acreage. We are spending billions for ships, for ammunition, for transports, for equipment, and for training our men; we are opening wide the doors of the Treasury to every war industry except agriculture. Would it not be well in the midst of these lavish expenditures to make sure of our food supply? Here is the way one of the great papers of Great Britain views the peril. The Daily Telegram in its issue Friday, March 15, 1918, among other things said:

We are approaching the supreme test of the issue which depends on the merchantmen. It may be a matter for serious consideration by the United States Government, whether it may not give more essential aid at this moment by holding back temporarily further reinforcement for their Army, with a consequent increase in the quantity of ocean-borne supplies.

The paper asserts that if American soldiers continue to come over at the present rate, tonnage which might be devoted to food will be utilized for military instead of economic purposes, and while both soldiers and food are required, food is the more urgent matter.

Another important item to be considered is the labor situation. Wheat is a crop that must be harvested immediately when ripe. It will not stand in the field for a long period, like corn and

cotton. Farmers consider this when they sow. The scarcity of farm labor and high prices for that available will make the farmer timid about planting wheat he is not sure he can harvest. High wages paid in war industrial activities, manufacturing, munition making, lumbering, carpentry, shipbuilding, railroading, and many others, with immunity from military service, has stripped the farm of workers. Farm laborers receive less pay and no deferred classification. Agricultural experts tell us 2,000,000 workers have been taken from farms in the past year for the Army and war works. It seems to me this is a colossal blunder. It is impossible to increase production with decreased man power. The administration of the selective service act has not been satisfactory to the people. Honorable men with dependents, men engaged in producing food on farms that now lie fallow, have been taken while men without encumbrance have been left at home. Personally I know of many such cases, and have repeatedly called them to the attention of the authorities. These authorities have uniformly shifted the blame to the local and district exemption boards.

After nearly running my legs off in an effort to get some relief, I finally placed the matter before the Provost Marshal's Office in record form so that the people might know where the blame belongs. On February 23, 1918, I addressed a letter to Gen. Crowder, as follows:

I desire to emphasize what I said to you yesterday regarding the labor situation as it affects the farmer and farming industry. I regard the classification given farm laborers as unfair, and believe if it is permitted to stand will shortly result in a paralysis of the farming industry. Farm laborers without dependents, unless graduates of an agricultural college, are classed as nonexpert laborers.

It may be said "anyone can break a furrow," but running a furrow is not all there is to farming. Every farmer must also be a business man and a small stock raiser. He must possess, if successful, unusual intelligence along many lines. He must know live stock, their habits, their dispositions, the diseases that commonly affect them. He must know how to care for them; how to feed them with the least possible loss and the greatest economy. They must be kept and raised on the farm at the same time the crops are planted, grown, and harvested. The crops must be so diversified as to produce a yield, and at the same time they must mature at different periods so that the live stock—the hogs, cattle, horses, and sheep—can be cared for. A successful farmer must not only possess great industry and high intelligence, but he must also be a good business man if he avoids bankruptcy. He must know how and when to plant; how to cultivate; and the proper time and method of harvesting. He must also know what to do with his yield; whether to sell, to hold for future market, or to feed and dispose of the same in live stock.

This knowledge can not be acquired overnight. It accumulates slowly and as the result of long years of training. You can not make a farmer out of a doctor, lawyer, baker, merchant, bank clerk, store clerk, a railroad, a carpenter, a painter, a factory worker, or a day laborer by waiving a wand and repeating the words "Presto change."

A large per cent of the persons following these different occupations could not stand the physical strain; the hours of labor and the exposure required of the farmer, and practically all of them would be compelled to learn the manifold and changing labors of the farm.

So, when a farm laborer is classified as "nonexpert" and sent to the trenches, he leaves a vacant place on the farm that is impossible to be filled. When the laborer on the railroad, in the factory, where guns and ammunition are made; in the factory, where clothes are cut and shaped; in the forest, where the timber for ships and aeroplanes is cut; in the yards, where the rivets are driven in the ships, aeroplanes, motors, freight, and passenger cars, is classified as "expert" and exempted from military service, a situation is produced which necessarily draws the farm laborer away from the farm.

The farm laborer can, by changing his occupation, change also his classification from that of a non-expert laborer subject to military duty to that of an expert laborer exempted from military duty. The preferred classification, together with higher wages paid in the factory and shop, over that received on the farm, has already depleted the farms of their laborers and brought about a situation which presents a serious national menace.

The farmers are not asking to be exempted from military service. They are quite willing to bear their full share of the burdens of this war. It is the duty, however, of those in command to look ahead and see that the farms are not stripped of their laborers. Bullets without bread will not win this war. I do not think the laborer on the farm should be preferred over any other class of labor. At the same time I do not think it fair nor in the interest of the public that he be discriminated against. I think the class of work he is performing is quite as important to the success of our arms as the labor performed by those engaged in any other industry.

If available, I would be glad to have a statistical report showing from what occupations the soldiers already called have come; the per cent from each, and particularly would I like to have this information as it affects my home State, Oklahoma.

On March 7 he replied:

In response to your letter of February 23, permit me to say that your analysis of the agricultural situation as affected by the selective-service law has had careful consideration.

With reference to the work of the district boards of your State in classifying farm laborers, the attention of the district boards has been invited through the adjutant general of the State to the fact that the definition of skilled labor is not to be restricted to graduates of agricultural schools or to those who have scientific or highly technical knowledge.

The adjustment of the labor supply on our farms as related to the necessities attendant upon the enrollment of our Army is the more difficult, because of the fact that before the enactment of the selective-service law the trend of labor was away from the farms.

The selective-service act and the presidential regulations issued pursuant thereto have placed the problem of relief from military service in respect of industrial and agricultural workers primarily in the hands of the district boards. The rules for deferred classification have been carefully worked out, with a view to providing a degree of protection

for agricultural interests coextensive with that provided other industries, and it is believed that the district boards in general, especially in agricultural regions, have keen interest in the maintenance of the farm-labor supply.

However, in farming communities it can not be expected that quotas can be raised without interference with farm labor, which in individual instances may seem severe.

As you are doubtless aware, a bill is pending before Congress which will authorize the granting of furloughs for agricultural workers already in the service for their temporary return to the farms. If this legislation is enacted, it may afford a considerable degree of relief to many farmers.

In your letter you requested statistics showing the occupations from which drafted men have been taken. Permit me to invite your attention to the report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War on the first draft, which gives many statistics. On page No. 62 of this report you will find a chapter headed "Industrial necessity as a ground for discharge." The tables there given will throw much light on the operation of the first draft in respect of agriculture. It is interesting to note the relatively small inroad made on agriculture as shown by these figures.

It is hoped that this will give you the information desired.

He continues to place the responsibility for errors on the local and district boards. The tragic part is they continue taking the farmers. Last week in one county in my district 16 out of 19 called were farmer boys. If this is continued, it does not promise increased food production.

The Committee on Agriculture has also reported a bill authorizing the Food Administrator to restrict the consumption of food in hotels and public eating houses and to prohibit the use of foods in the manufacture of nonessentials, and so forth.

I doubt if it will assist to any appreciable extent in solving food difficulties. I shall, however, gladly support those provisions desired by the administration. There is one provision, however, to which I wish to direct your attention. It is the clause giving the Food Administrator power to ration. It reads:

(c) Prescribing the more equitable and economic distribution of foodstuffs and feeds by limiting and regulating the sale, purchase, and distribution by any manufacturer or person engaged in the business of distributing foodstuffs, feeds, or materials or equipment necessary for the production, manufacture, or preservation of foodstuffs or feed: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to any farmer or gardener, including live-stock farmers, with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him.

The proviso excepting "any farmer or gardener, including live-stock farmers, with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him" makes it possible for one who can deal direct with the farmer, gardener, and live-stock raiser to evade the law. The bill will not affect the rich who can purchase direct from the producer. The authority conferred is unlimited. He may "regulate the sale, purchase, and distribution by any manufacturer or person engaged in the business of distributing foodstuffs, feeds, or materials or equipment necessary for the production, manufacture, or preservation of foodstuffs or feeds." If the Food Administrator can limit the amount of sugar, salt, or any other food the retailer can sell and the amount a person can purchase, he can ration every man, woman, and child in the country. I do not believe it necessary or wise to enact a rationing statute at this time. The effect will not be wholesome. If, in the future, it should become necessary, Congress will be in session and can act. The President has not asked it. Mr. Hoover, before the committee, said he did not desire such authority. Rationing has proven a failure wherever tried. England, France, Italy, and Germany so report. Its enforcement is expensive and irritating; it requires an army of petty officers nosing and prying into the kitchen affairs of every household. It consumes a large part of the people's time forcing them in line with bread cards.

There are two classes of folks who can not be reached by rationing legislation; it does not reach them in Germany—the producer and the wealthy. The producer manages in some way to hold out sufficient for himself and family and the wealthy are able to deal with the producer direct, and thus avoid the law. The Government can not keep a policeman in every farmer's door. The only classes reached by this legislation are the poor, the workers, and those unable to sport the luxury of automobiles. There is no necessity for such legislation. The farmers will produce and produce abundantly if properly encouraged. Prices that yield a profitable return will stimulate and increase production. In this connection it might be well to recall that prices are always high in war times; everything is abnormal and prices therefore are out of the ordinary. We think prices are high to-day when we are fighting the war for democracy, but they are not so high as in the days when our forefathers were winning our independence. Here are a few prices in 1776:

Meat	per pound	\$1 to \$2
Rye	per bushel	30
Molasses	per gallon	12
Butterine	per pound	3
Corn	per bushel	25
Potatoes	do	10
Flour	per pound	5
Cheese	do	2
Sugar	do	3

In 1779 sugar sold for \$4 per pound; in 1780 butter sold for \$12 per pound and tea \$40 per pound. I do not give these figures to justify such prices now and I hope prices will not mount higher as the war proceeds. War, however, is but a manifestation of an unusual upheaval and high prices always follow in its wake. If it continues for any considerable time, prices will soar far higher than any heretofore known. If production is not increased, I greatly fear the question will not be so much the price of a loaf, but can a loaf be obtained at any price?

Those who would visit all the burden of this war on the producer may say if the farmer's price is raised the cost to the consumer will be increased. The answer is, "The burden of this war should not be borne by any part of the people but by the whole people equitably distributed. In England, France, and Italy the people are paying less for flour than the people of the United States, where it is produced. On the 23d of February, 1918, I addressed a letter to Mr. Hoover, which in part reads:

If available, I would be glad to be furnished with the following information:

1. The price the consumer is required to pay for flour in Great Britain, France, and Italy.

On March 1 Mr. Hoover sent me an inter-office memorandum, which reads in part as follows:

In compliance with the request of Hon. JOE B. THOMPSON in his letter of February 23, I may say that the retail prices of flour in the countries named is as follows, according to the latest reports:

GREAT BRITAIN.

(1) Flour: On a sack of 280 pounds of flour the maximum retail price is \$11.91, equivalent to \$8.33 per barrel of 196 pounds, the American unit.

ITALY.

(1) Flour: The market price on November 1, 1917, was 54 lire per quintal, equivalent to \$6 per barrel at the rate of exchange prevailing on that date.

FRANCE.

(1) Flour: No retail prices are available. The wholesale price of flour, 61.3 francs per quintal is equivalent to \$9.53 per barrel.

Why is this possible? It is because they are doing across the sea what we have not done. They fix the price paid the producer and the cost to the consumer; they squeezed out the profiteer and took care of the differential between producer and consumer from the national treasury. They refused to visit upon any part of the people the burdens of the war; they make all the people bear these burdens equitably. In this way they have been able to pay better prices to the producer than our producers receive and to sell to the consumer for less than our consumers pay.

The Commerce Reports, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, on February 2, 1918, contained this information:

Food controller fixes prices for grain harvested in United Kingdom in 1918. Wheat and rye will be based on average price of 75s. per quarter of 504 pounds; barley, 65s. per quarter of 448 pounds; oats, 46s. 3d. per quarter of 336 pounds. Higher prices will be allowed for better classes of oats for milling purposes.

Translated this means \$2.17½ for wheat, \$2.02½ for rye, \$1.69½ for barley, and \$1.27 for oats. These prices are better than the American farmer receives. This is done by reducing the profit of middle men and making the differential a charge against the national treasury. Since 1914 Great Britain has paid out of its treasury more than half a billion dollars to care for this differential. That Government has also stimulated production by paying a bonus on every acre of wheat planted regardless of the amount produced.

This has been done across the sea to stimulate production, and if the war continues, as in my judgment it will, Congress will soon be forced to some such measure here.

We should not forget in considering this question it is necessary for us to think in relative terms. Gold has increased many fold. The Federal Reserve System authorized a 60 per cent asset currency; billions of bonds have been issued. The modern method of doing business has created what for lack of a better term might be called "check currency." All these concurring have produced an enormous expansion in our currency. Dollars have multiplied, but their purchasing power has decreased in the same ratio.

Nor should we lose sight of the fact our consumers are not profiting by the fixed price of wheat. Every time they buy a pound of flour they are required to purchase a pound of flour substitute—meal, oatmeal, rice, and so forth. While it is true the price of flour was slightly reduced when the wheat price was fixed, the price of meal, oatmeal, rice, and other wheat substitutes has increased, and the consumer finds the cost of living on the whole as high now as before. Those who have benefited by the operation are the consumers living oversea. We loan them money, and with it they purchase our bread at a price less than it costs our own people.

Mr. Chairman, two distinct and antagonistic forms of government are facing each other in a life and death struggle. Somewhere on the battle fields of Europe will be determined whether justice and liberty or brute force shall rule the world. We can not lose. It would be contrary to the laws of God. Let us so coordinate our every activity that there will be unity in spirit and purpose among all classes of our people. In this faith and under the guidance of our matchless leader we will go forward to certain victory. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was being considered in the House on the 18th of last month I offered an amendment to an item in that bill for the purchase and sale of seeds for cash, providing that those seeds might be sold on credit. That bill will become a law within a day or two, and had my amendment been adopted the farmers would soon be receiving seed. It was not adopted, however, and I hope that this bill will pass. When the proper time comes I desire to offer an amendment adding to the cereals enumerated in the bill, the purchase of which is proposed, rye, which is the surest cereal crop grown in the semiarid sections of the Northwest. It should be added to those mentioned in the bill. I hope this bill will become a law, but I regret that it has been so long delayed. I fear if there is any delay in the Senate the season will be so far advanced before the bill becomes a law that it will be of very little benefit to the farmers this season.

I discussed at length on the 15th of last month, during the general debate, and later, on the 18th, when I offered the amendment to the deficiency bill, the need of seeds on credit by the farmers of certain portions of the West. Drought has been severe in certain sections and seed is scarce and high. I hope this bill will help, and regret the plan I proposed more than a month ago was not adopted.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks particularly to section 2 of the bill under consideration, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for and secure mobilization and distribution of farm labor. To my mind a prime requisite, so far as the production of food and feed in the country at this time is concerned, is that of farm labor. In my native State there is no such thing any more as sufficient farm labor. It is extinct. The farmers have to compete in bidding for hands with manufacturing concerns, munition plants, and others engaged in the making of war materials and other merchandise. The result has been that the farms have been drained of the labor they once had by the young men and the older ones going to the cities where the hours of labor have been more inviting and where eight hours are considered a full day's labor; whereas, on the farm, as we all know, it is a question of work from sunup until dark. Volunteer enlistments and the draft have also cut deeply into the labor supply.

Mr. Chairman, a survey has been made in a general sort of way of the farm-labor situation in some of the States, and report has been made thereon in some of the leading farm journals. Those reports show the widespread shortage and requirement of farm labor. This bill will help out, we think, to some extent. It is not expected by the proponents of the measure that it is a cure-all, but it will help some. To show how Nation wide is the demand for farm labor I desire to read the following summary of reports that have been turned in from the various States:

"Maine: Great shortage of farm labor; acreage probably will be reduced by one-fourth or one-third. Texas: More labor needed than ever before, but supply is much below normal. North Dakota: Alarming shortage; farmers discouraged and can not plant for normal crop. Vermont: Shortage means a cut in production. Massachusetts: Serious situation; farmers can not go ahead with only the help of boys and untrained workmen. Connecticut: Depressing conditions; farmers may try to raise only enough for their families. Rhode Island: Many will not plant as much as last year. New Jersey: Farmers think that planting of even the usual acreage will be very hazardous. Pennsylvania: Very great shortage of skilled farm labor; the exodus from farms has been continuous. Delaware: Unless relief comes, the usual acreage can not be prepared. Maryland: Labor situation is acute. Virginia: Lack of labor, and acreage reduced accordingly. Georgia: Impossible to cultivate as much land as last year's area. Florida: Affected by loss of negro workmen drawn to the North; hope the Government will bring Porto Ricans. Ohio: Farmers discouraged and

at their wits' ends. Indiana: Probably a reduction of acreage. Illinois: The number of idle acres will be increased."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If all of these localities are so short of labor, how is the money, two and a half million dollars, to be expended in finding labor to be sent to other localities that are also short?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I will say to my friend that there are many people in the country who may make good farm labor, who could be collected under the provisions of this bill and sent to places where they could do the most good. They may be taken from unnecessary occupations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am quite serious about this. In western Washington the lumber labor shortage was so serious that soldier labor had to be sent in there to make up the deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope what I say will not be misunderstood, for it is not my intention to criticize the administration or in any way to oppose legislation that will help in winning the war.

This is a time when everybody is required to do their utmost in their particular line of duty whether it be on the battle field, in the factory, or on the farm.

The legislation under consideration has to do with the farmer or producer of food for all mankind, and there is not a man in this Congress who will do more to help that class of citizen than myself.

We all know when bountiful crops are produced the farmer not only helps himself, but it is the consumer as well that receives the direct benefit of his efforts, and I feel that an injustice has been done to the man who toils for the production of crops when we singled out the result of that toil and by price-fixing legislation placed a limit on what he shall receive for his product and permit the charging of unlimited prices for what he must buy and what is essential to make his crops possible.

The price-fixing arrangement is confused by rules and regulations adopted for a good purpose, no doubt, but so far from being practical that the manufacturer of food products does not know where he stands, and the farmer also has become discouraged and has lost sight of the importance of his mission simply because he has been chosen as the one expected to do the most for the least return, when, in fact, the law under which the price of his product has been limited is supposed not to regulate or control his effort.

I recall the speech I made in this House on June 20 of last year, in which I predicted just what the result would be, and at that time I was strongly opposed to price fixing unless it was made to apply to both producer and consumer.

Under the license feature of the food-control law the President fixed the price of wheat, and if he can say what is to be paid for wheat and what the products of wheat shall be sold for certainly he can do the same with other grains and foods.

Our farmers are to-day asked to plant a larger acreage of wheat, and to show the unfairness of such a request I quote the prevailing prices of relative grains:

- No. 1 spring wheat, \$2.20, Chicago, for 60 pounds.
- No. 1 winter wheat, \$2.17, Chicago, for 60 pounds.
- No. 2 rye, \$2.91, Chicago, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 white corn, \$2.25, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 yellow corn, \$2.25, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 3 yellow corn, \$1.90, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 white oats, \$1.08, Philadelphia and New York, for 32 pounds.

From these prices you will see that with the exception of oats wheat is the lowest of all grain, and the farmer knows that with the same effort he can produce from two to three times as much corn, oats, rye, or barley per acre, and he will be a hard man to convince that this sacrifice is necessary when the coarser grains are being used instead of wheat and will yield such greater return.

The consumers have been appealed to to cooperate in the saving of wheat, and have willingly accepted the ruling of the Food Administration to buy a pound of substitute with each pound of wheat flour, but they, too, are becoming discouraged when

compelled to pay a premium for the substitute or inferior article, much of which is wasted for want of knowledge as to its best use. Let me quote what the consumer must pay for grain products:

	Per barrel.
Wheat flour.....	\$11.00 to \$12.00
Rye flour.....	14.50 to 15.50
Corn meal.....	11.00 to 14.00
Oat meal.....	13.00 to 15.00

From the above I am convinced that the Food Administration, by lack of complete regulation, has placed a penalty rather than a reward on the consumer for the sacrifice he is making.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would like to do so, but I have not the time.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like just to get a comparison of those prices.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I have not the time; I will later if I have the time.

We have a new proposition before us, one that unless handled properly will stand out in future years as a rebuke to our judgment, and rather than spend money for seed wheat, to be sold to the farmers on credit, I would be willing to advocate the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the purchase and free distribution of seed wheat under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, such seed to be available to those who are unable to purchase seed or any farmer who would be willing to cultivate such a crop under rules and regulations prescribed by the Department of Agriculture.

By an arrangement of this kind our Western States could be made to increase their yield of spring wheat at least 50 per cent, which would remove all question of a wheat shortage.

I have before me a publication called the Seed Reporter, issued by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, which shows how the Grain Corporation proposes to take care of the seed-wheat business on a small profit for the purpose of increasing production. We are told by the Grain Corporation, which, by the way, is a child of the Food Administration, that they have 500,000 bushels of Marquis spring wheat to supply Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, all winter wheat States, and in which the planting of spring wheat would be an experiment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the name of the publication.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The Seed Reporter, March 20, 1918.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a Government publication?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, sir. Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture.

This wheat is in Buffalo, and has cost the Grain Corporation about \$2.25 per bushel, and they propose to sell it by the car to any dealer or elevator man at \$2.35 per bushel f. o. b. Buffalo, and the dealer or elevator man has the privilege to resell the grain to the farmer for 15 per cent increase over that price, or a profit of 35 cents per bushel. If a man is unable to purchase a full carload he may buy a less quantity, but the price will be \$2.65 per bushel, and by the time this reaches the farmer, with the 15 per cent added, it will cost him \$3.05 per bushel sacked.

When you consider these profits, compared with those allowed by the rules of the different exchanges dealing in wholesale grain, you can get an idea that the Grain Corporation has gone far from the policy of doing business at cost, especially when the Government furnishes the capital without interest, which amounted to \$150,000,000, in the food-control bill for a revolving fund, and also \$2,500,000 for administration expenses, and a further appropriation of \$1,750,000 in the recent urgent deficiency bill, making a total of \$4,250,000 for expenses from August 10 to June 30 of the present year.

In normal business the brokerage on grain permitted by the different exchanges usually run from $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 cent per bushel, which, together with interest, insurance, and storage, seldom makes more than 3 cents per bushel.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Grain Corporation has no right to conduct business for a greater profit than will pay their expenses, especially when its chief function is to encourage the production and regulate the distribution of grain, and if the situation is so serious as to require the furnishing of seed wheat the Department of Agriculture should be authorized to make free distribution, and with their efficient organization keep strict supervision over the planting and growing and use every possible means to see that the results desired are accomplished. [Applause.]

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. I was going to ask the gentleman if the gentleman could give the relative difference in price between wheat and corn, wheat and oats, wheat and rye, say, three years ago?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I can not recall just what it was.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman insert it in his extension?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

On page 30 of the Monthly Crop Report, published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, issue of March, 1918, the following figures are given as the average prices paid to producers, based on reports from 7,000 country buyers. This table does not include commissions, insurance, elevator charges, or freight to destination.

	Wheat.	Corn.	Rye.	Oats.	Barley.
Mar. 1, 1915.....	\$1.336	\$0.751	\$1.051	\$0.521	\$0.677
Mar. 1, 1916.....	1.029	.682	.835	.427	.595
Mar. 1, 1917.....	1.644	1.009	1.26	.569	.999
Mar. 1, 1918.....	2.027	1.543	2.01	.862	1.161

Mr. WALDOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

Mr. WALDOW. This grain corporation of which the gentleman speaks is a corporation authorized by Mr. Hoover, is it not?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask the privilege of extending and revising my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think that some of the gentlemen present do not understand just what this bill is and the principle on which it is framed. Appropriating a comparatively small sum, \$7,500,000, it is solely for the purpose of supplying seed grain to the farmers of the spring-wheat area where they are not able to buy it. It has been urged that it ought to be extended and that seed grain ought to be made available all over the country. I think gentlemen who are urging that really do not mean what they say. This amount of money will not cover the entire country. This is for a part of the country in which, on account of failure of crops, the people are not able at this time to buy the wheat or other grain, nor have they credit with which to buy it. When a gentleman from one of the other States asks that his State be put in with the spring-wheat States he does not mean what he says, and he loses sight of what has been done and is being prepared for other sections. Other bills that have been passed and have become laws, other bills that are pending, that will be passed provide for more money and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of seed grains at cost. The other States in which it is difficult to get seed grain will be accommodated by those laws. I am sure that the great State of New York, from which we hear opposition to this bill; the great State of Massachusetts, and some others, do not wish to come to Congress and ask for Federal aid.

In the first place, I think the farmers of those States are abundantly able to buy seed if they have an opportunity to do so, and that business and financial interests of those States are abundantly able and ought to be willing to help their farmers who are not able to buy and have no credit. They are not in the unfortunate condition in which the people whom this bill will help are now placed. Now, the Committee on Agriculture refused to approve this bill when it first came before the committee because it did not approve the principle of indiscriminate loaning of money by the Government to the farmers or supplying seed on credit, whether they need it or not; but, after extended hearings and testimony brought before the committee to the effect that the spring-wheat section of the country is in great need and must have this help, a majority of the committee yielded and prepared and reported this bill. I early urged financial assistance to farmers to enable them to procure seed, but the majority of the committee were tardy in taking that position. That is the situation in which the bill in its present limited scope comes before the House, and that is the reason the committee has reported it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do.

Mr. CANNON. This provides for spring wheat?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. For the spring-wheat area.

Mr. CANNON. I am informed by the Representative from South Dakota that his State has fully provided—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. North Dakota.

Mr. CANNON. And also North Dakota.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. North Dakota, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, has at a session of its legislature authorized the counties to bond for that purpose, and they have pretty well taken care of the needs of their people. There has been some action by the people of South Dakota, and they have given as far as they are able—

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from South Dakota informed me that they had fully cared for it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not understand the situation has been fully taken care of in the State of South Dakota, but shall be pleased to be corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. DILLON. If the gentleman will yield, I might say that South Dakota has had no failure of crops and that our legislature convened last week and provided by resolution that we did not need this aid. They are only taking care of their own people.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, this "last week" was since this bill was reported. This bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture nearly three weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am altogether unable to account for the attitude of gentlemen of this Congress who oppose almost every measure calculated to assist the farmers of the country. They realize, as every sane man does, that there must be increased production of farm crops, particularly wheat. They join in the demand for larger crops, and swell the popular cry that "food will win the war." They are sensible enough to place food on a level with munitions and men for the Army and Navy; they vote for appropriations carrying billions of money, and authorize the departments to enter into contracts with private corporations for munitions, ships, aircraft, and material and supplies of all kinds; to make contracts by which money and material are advanced and supplied by the Government, and in addition, in many cases, the corporations are guaranteed a profit on all their operations. But as to the farmers, the Congress and the administration appeal to their patriotism and let it go at that; the suggestion of contracting for production of wheat or other farm products or of financial assistance in procuring seed is scoffed at; or if help is given it is given grudgingly and not in sufficient measure. I do not forget that the food-control act of August last guarantees a minimum price of \$2 a bushel for wheat of the 1918 harvest, but the failure in any manner to regulate the prices farmers pay for machinery and equipment, or prices of other things farmers must buy, has so increased the cost of farm operations that \$2 wheat is not very profitable. A minimum price of \$2.20 was fixed for wheat, the crop of 1917, but the manner in which that price was fixed or the manner of control of the wheat market by the Food Administration has resulted in making that price the maximum as well as the minimum price. The result has been, further, that prices of all other grains, in no way regulated or interfered with by the Food Administrator, have risen very high, out of all proportion to the price of wheat, and during 1918, at least, the farmers will find larger profit in growing the other grains than in growing wheat. In the face of this novel and unfortunate situation the farmers are urged to continue to sow wheat; their patriotism is appealed to, but substantial assistance is refused—assistance, if promptly given, that would encourage them and enable them to overcome some of the serious difficulties confronting them.

This bill was prepared and reported in the hope that this substantial assistance might be given.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized—

* * * to make advances or loans to farmers in the spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers * * * upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe.

And provides further—

That a first lien on the crop to be produced from such seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed security therefor, and that the total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450.

It seems to me the amount of money to be here appropriated for this purpose, \$7,500,000, is small, when we consider the urgent and immediate need of assistance to farmers of the spring-wheat section of the country, the only section in which an increased production of wheat can be had this year; and as we take into consideration the immense sums of money expended or provided for other war operations, some of them of no greater importance than is the growing of grain for food.

It has been said here that as the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized by this measure, if it shall become law, to loan money or supply seed grain to farmers "upon such terms

and conditions and subject to such regulations" as he may prescribe, he would virtually be authorized to enter into contracts with farmers for the production of grain. And why should not contracts for foodstuffs be made? Money so used will produce larger and better results than will expenditures in many of the other of the activities in which we are engaged during this war emergency. There will certainly be abundant return to justify the expenditure of this money—or for its investment, as it surely is—and in my humble judgment the bill, more restricted in its terms than it ought to be, ought to be passed, and it must be passed and become law without further delay if it is to be of use this year.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that his time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER].

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Committee on Agriculture for its patience, its hearty cooperation and support of this measure.

Its indorsement of this bill is sufficient argument for its passage. This bill was considered from every angle and entirely upon its merits. It is not a partisan measure. It is a war measure, and there is no partisanship in patriotism. I believe that Congress will act with the same high spirit of patriotism and nonpartisanship with which it has met all the war emergencies.

Critical conditions without parallel have compelled me to urge the passage of this resolution. I believe that you realize the gravity of the situation and the imperative necessity of food at this time. This war will be won by the gradual process of attrition; that is the gradual exhausting of the enemy's resources. Victory rests with the side that has the last bushel of grain in its bin; and I want to see that Uncle Sam is on that side. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield? I am not antagonistic to the bill. I shall vote for it. You provide by this bill that this money shall be loaned through State and national banks. Are the banks of your State refusing now to make these loans, as they are authorized to do under the Federal reserve act?

Mr. BAER. There is no authorization for loaning money for seed under the Federal reserve act unless the bank guarantees it.

Mr. WINGO. You have got to make a showing that it is for agricultural purposes, and, of course, properly indorsed. Under the Federal reserve act when any farmer gives his note for getting seed or implements or fertilizer for the purpose of the production of food, such a note is eligible for rediscount at the Federal reserve bank, and against it Federal reserve notes may be issued.

Mr. BAER. I want to say to the gentleman that in North Dakota—

Mr. WINGO. Are your banks refusing to grant that relief?

Mr. BAER. No. They can not give the relief, however, because they have not sufficient money. The liberty loans and other conditions have taken the money out of the State. They will loan on land and chattels.

Mr. WINGO. I am not talking about loans on the land. That is under the farm-loan act. But I am talking about the agricultural paper provision of the Federal reserve act. Unless I am misinformed, your Federal reserve bank is in Minneapolis?

Mr. BAER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Unless I am misinformed, that bank has already loaned \$1,700,000 on this character of paper. If your banks are not granting the relief they should if able, and as they seem unable, I can see the necessity for this relief, and for that reason shall vote for it.

Mr. BAER. I have the reports, in which they say they can not get the relief.

Mr. WINGO. If the banks will not grant the relief—

Mr. BAER. The banks have got to guarantee it. That is another reason, in addition to lack of funds. I can not yield further.

There is plenty of authority in support of this measure. Mr. Hoover says that Congress should make considerable appropriations to farmers who need advances against animals and crops. Mr. Lubin, of the Agricultural Institute of Rome, says that the allies are depending upon the United States for food.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BAER. I can not yield further.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One question.

Mr. BAER. I can not yield.

Lord Rhondda, the food controller of England, says if we do not ship England more wheat he can not take the responsibility of assuring his people that they can win this war.

I have received 14,000 answers to questionnaires showing the need. In fact there are 40,000 homesteaders and twice as many needy farmers in the Northwest who require credit. They have the land and the man power, but need seed on time.

Our farmers have striven and will strive to support our Nation, and those who have seed and are guaranteed labor will raise every possible bushel of wheat they can.

True, the Agricultural Department has made arrangements to have seed on the ground to be sold for cash, but this seed will be of no value to the farmer who has not sufficient funds to buy it. The farmer who has sufficient funds usually carries over enough seed grain for the spring seeding. It is the farmer who has not the seed and has not the credit of whom I am speaking.

There can be no question as to the imperative necessity of increased production. The winter wheat has been planted. The poorest average condition of winter wheat on December 1, 1917, ever reported in the history of the country. On December 1, 1917, the average winter wheat was 79.2 per cent as against 81.4 per cent in December, 1895, the lowest condition ever hitherto reported, and as against 85.7 per cent in December, 1916, when the crop of winter wheat at the following harvest was wholly inadequate to meet our needs. It does not show a yield of over half a billion bushels. The Department of Agriculture has stated that they need a billion bushels. This is impossible. The highest yield of spring wheat in history was 340,000,000 bushels; the average is about 240,000,000 bushels. With the decrease in farm labor and other discouragements it is impossible to raise 250,000,000 bushels of spring wheat, but we must come as close to this as possible. The only way we can approach this need is by passing this bill, which will insure the planting of 3,000,000 acres of wheat with a possible production of 50,000,000 bushels of grain.

If we neglect to pass this measure thousands of acres will remain untilled. Thousands of plowshares will rust and will stand as a reproach of our negligence. To you men who represent city populations I want to say that if you are anxious to decrease the cost of living, vote for this bill. Increased production means the lower cost of living, and food shortage in this country or among our allies would be a very serious problem at this time. Dissatisfaction and social unrest the world over is caused by the lack of bread.

True, we are conserving and we will conserve, but conservation alone will not solve the problem, even if we conserve to a point that endangers the virility of the Nation. Our workers in factories and war industries have been asked to work longer hours to increase production. This raises the question of stamina. If we expect these men to work harder, they naturally will eat more. I believe the conservation problem is a splendid one, but I also want to urge the greatest production. This is the hour of decision. If we do not act, I believe a famine faces the world.

We have basked in the fancied security of our statistics long enough. Let us face the fact and wake up. Let us plant every idle acre. Let us mobilize labor to get the crops out in due season. Agriculture is the chief basis of national prosperity and credit. Let us support this measure; first, to produce more food for our allies and ourselves; secondly, as a vote of confidence in the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am sorry that I can not yield to the gentleman more time. I have about 30 on the list here.

By unanimous consent, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. FOCHT were granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and upon that I ask for tellers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Mr. CANNON. Does that motion take precedence of the gentleman's point of order that there is no quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion for the committee to rise, the Chair thinks, would take precedence.

Mr. LEVER. I insist on my motion, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. LEVER and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania took their places as tellers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair state the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the question. Those who favor the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 2, noes 81.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee refuses to rise.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, not a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there is not a quorum present. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is evident from the vote that there is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Rosenberg
Barkley	Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Rose
Blackmon	Gandy	Kettner	Rouse
Borland	Gard	Key, Ohio	Rawland
Brodbeck	Glass	Kitchin	Sanders, La.
Burnett	Good	Lafaurdia	Sanders, N. Y.
Calwell	Goodall	Lazaro	Sanford
Campbell, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lenroot	Schall
Carew	Gould	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham Pa.	McCluskey	Seely
Classon	Gray, Ala.	McKinley	Shirley
Cooper, Ohio	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Cooper, W. Va.	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Sims
Copley	Griest	Meeker	Simp
Costello	Griffin	Miller, Minn.	Small
Crago	Hamill	Miller Wash.	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mondell	Steele
Lavison	Harrison, Miss.	Mott	Steing, Pa.
Denison	Harrison, Va.	Nicholls, S. C.	Stines
Denton	Hayden	Nichols, Mich.	Strong
Dies	Haves	O'Shaunessy	Sullivan
Dooling	Hentz	Overmyer	Templeton
Doremus	Helvering	Parker, N. J.	Thomas
Drukner	Hersey	Parker, N. Y.	Tirkhom
Dunn	Hollingsworth	Peters	Van Dyke
Edmonds	Houston	Porter	Vinson
Ellsworth	Hull, Iowa	Powers	Ward
Estopinal	Humphreys	Price	Watkins
Fairchild B. L.	Igoe	Ragsdale	White, Me.
Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey	Williams
Fairfield	Jones, Va.	Reed	Wood, Ind.
Fess	Kahn	Riordan	Woodyard
	Kehoe	Roberts	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POW, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the committee substitute for the bill H. R. 7795, had found itself without a quorum, and he had caused the roll to be called, whereupon 300 gentlemen had answered "present"; and he submitted a list of absentees to be recorded in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for four solid days this House spent its time in the very important matter of fixing the salaries of postal clerks, post-office officials, and the like. A quorum was always present when that bill was being considered. That was a bill taking something out of the Federal Treasury in the way of salaries for somebody else, mostly somebody else who are organized and have votes. [Laughter.] Here is a proposition which a great committee of this House believes is important in the winning of this war, and yet gentlemen come in here and make a point of no quorum, and, after the Chairman of the committee exhausts every parliamentary expedient to get a quorum here, we are not able to find it. We have killed 25 minutes in calling the roll because there was no quorum present.

I am not scolding the House at all, and I rise only for the purpose of saying that if the friends of this measure are sufficiently in earnest and are in the majority in this House to put this bill through, and will stay with me, we will keep this committee running until the break of day and put it through. Now, will you stay? [Applause.]

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this bill appears to me to be very important to the country. In the hour or more of discussion of it several objections have been made to it. One of them was that it applied to only a limited section of the country.

Another was that the bill was fathered by the Nonpartisan League. Another was something else.

Now, I beg to suggest to this House—and I may repeat some things that I said this morning in discussing the rule—the question of authorship of this bill should not enter into it at all. This is not the bill of the Nonpartisan League, I may say. Last August I introduced a bill practically like this. I foresaw that the drought in that western country would cause a shortage of crops, and I introduced a bill and hoped to get it through in time for last fall's planting.

Mr. GORDON. What would you do in case you had another drought? What would you do for these men to whom you have loaned the money?

Mr. EVANS. There would be a greater shortage of wheat than there is now.

Mr. GORDON. And there would be a shortage of the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS. But what will you say if you lose your aeroplanes? Will you get them back? What will you say if you lose your ships? Will you get them back? What will you say if the soldiers are killed? Will you get them back? We are trying to save them, not trying to get something back.

In all that western country, as I said to you this morning, there are thousands of people—and they are not beggars—who can not give any security except the crop. They do not ask the Government to give them anything, but the Government asks them to raise the wheat, and they say, "We will go you fifty-fifty. If we get a crop, we will pay you back." If they do not get a crop this year, they may not pay it back this year, but—

Mr. MORGAN. Because they do not pay it back this year, that is no sign that they will not ever pay it back. I object to your saying they will not pay it back.

Mr. EVANS. I say if they get a crop they will pay it back on this year's crop.

Mr. GORDON. It is not proposed to take security, but take a chance on this year's crop?

Mr. EVANS. Great God! If they had security they could go to the bank or to the financial institution and borrow the money. That is the kind of men we are trying to help—those who have not the security to give.

Gentlemen, in that section of the country thousands of homestead entries are being made. I am sure 80,000 a year are being made in the public-land States. Those men can not get title in one, two, or three years.

If there are 60,000 a year, there are at least 180,000 of these homestead entrymen of the last three years that have not got title to their lands. They are new people. They have just recently come into that country. They have nothing but their courage and the muscle of their arms to start with.

Mr. CRAMTON. While the Government takes a chance on a few dollars to furnish the seed, the farmer takes the chance of his farm and all his time?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; and the Government does not take a chance longer than six months.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Government preferred to treat the farmer as he treats the manufacturers of munitions—furnishing material and paying a per cent of profit on the cost of production—if it would make the same arrangement with the farmer, furnishing material and paying him a per cent or measure of profit on the production, the farmer then taking no chances, I suppose your farmers would not object to that arrangement.

Mr. EVANS. They are not even asking that.

Mr. CRAMTON. But then they would be on an equality basis with the munitions manufacturers?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The only difference is that the munition manufacturer in every instance has got property to secure the loan the Government makes to him.

Mr. MORGAN. How much?

Mr. GORDON. The Government does not advance any money unless it is secured.

Mr. CRAMTON. But they are dead sure of a profit.

Mr. GORDON. The Government is dead sure of getting its money back, too.

Mr. EVANS. Let me suggest that in the section from which I come we do not gauge citizenship by the amount of money a man has in his pocket or the credit he has at a bank. [Applause.] We have thousands of these men, who are without title to their property.

They are a courageous, patriotic, self-reliant people. They have just settled in that broad expanse of territory. They are building homes and schoolhouses and roads and bridges. There are no cities of importance. There are no financial centers there, no financial institutions able to extend credit to

these people. Anyone conversant with the settlement of a new country knows that if in the period of two or three years, three or four hundred thousand people migrate into a new farming country, that their greatest drawback is money with which to do business. Ten years from now these people will all be well to do. They have lands—productive lands—but they have not title to these lands and they therefore have nothing to give as security to the man who has money to loan. And, as suggested, there are exceedingly few men in that section who have money to loan because they, too, are new in the country. I hope no one will gain the impression that the people of Montana are mendicants or beggars. There are no more courageous, self-reliant, or patriotic people in the world than these people, half of whom have come into the State within the last two or three years; and everyone knows that as a rule the man who leaves his home and comes to take up land in a new country is a man without money. If he had already gotten a start in life, if he was in good circumstances, he would probably have remained at his original home and not gone into a new country to endure the hardships that are always entailed with such a settlement. Western Montana, the older settled part of the State, is amply capable and willing to take care of any demands made upon its people. The territory to which I here refer is that great expanse of eastern Montana, a territory 400 miles long and 200 miles wide. The men of this House do not seem to grasp the situation. Again I say the people of Montana are not lacking in patriotism, nor are they beggars. When the call to arms was sounded in this country, Montana furnished more men in proportion to her population than any State in the Union. When both liberty loans were placed before our people, we oversubscribed the same to a greater extent than the people of any other State in the Union in proportion to our assessed valuation. When the Red Cross call was made, we oversubscribed our allotment 250 per cent. To show you how that State has grown I beg to say that in two years the voting population increased 143 per cent. That State has two Representatives on the floor of this House based upon the census of 1900, and yet we registered more men under the selective draft than did either of the Dakotas with three Representatives, more than the State of Colorado with four Representatives, more than the State of Washington with five Representatives, almost as many as the State of Kansas with six Representatives. We were able to do this because a large percentage of the newer population are young, sturdy, single men who have come into that State to build homes out of a wilderness. This is the class of people that proponents of this bill ask that seed may be furnished this year that they may double the production of wheat in that section. These people are pioneers—real pioneers—and they are not asking any charity at the hands of the Government.

They want to do their bit. They want to pay for everything they get. When a crop is made they will pay for all seed furnished them, and above all they are patriotic and want to win the war. They want to raise wheat because they are on wheat land and because the American people need the wheat. It is just as important to the American people that we have wheat as it is that we have guns and ships and munitions. Last year we spent nearly twenty billions of dollars in an effort to terminate the war. The President, the Food Administrator, and all other farseeing men are begging and urging the people to conserve the bread supply and to produce more foodstuffs, and we here in Congress haggle over the proposition of appropriating seven and a half million dollars to furnish our armies with bread. We have appropriated money to furnish the capital for the conduct of the railroads, for shipbuilding, for munitions of war, for fertilizer, but we balk when it comes to furnishing money for seed to produce foodstuffs. This is not a "pork-barrel" measure; it is a war measure; and I confidently believe that in proportion to the money carried in this bill it will bring as much or better results than any similar amount of money expended elsewhere in the twenty billions of dollars already appropriated.

Mr. GORDON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Montana be extended five minutes. He was interrupted by Members, including myself.

Mr. WALDOW. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL] two minutes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I come from that part of the wheat country which lies between the Rocky Mountains and the Cascades, known as the dry-wheat section, and I can say that there are literally thousands of farmers in that country who will be able to raise greater acreages of wheat if seed wheat can be furnished them on short credit. The conditions that have been

described as existing in the State of Montana because of the drought exist to a large extent throughout eastern Washington and the adjoining regions. That country has been producing about 20,000,000 bushels of wheat each year. Unless there is some help given to these farmers much of the land that was broken last summer for wheat this spring will not be planted. Because of the drought last year the wheat crop was a failure in many sections. There was a small acreage of wheat planted last fall, and I have received large numbers of letters from farmers asking for this legislation.

Mr. KEARNS. Why can they not go to their local banks and borrow this money?

Mr. DILL. For the simple reason that many of them are tenant farmers who have no security on which to borrow money from the banks. A large number of others are homesteaders or are too poor to give the necessary security.

Mr. KEARNS. What security are they going to give the Government?

Mr. DILL. They will give simply the security of the crop that they will raise.

Mr. KEARNS. Why can they not go to the banks and get the banks to loan them money on that same security?

Mr. DILL. Because the banks will not accept it.

Mr. KEARNS. Why should the Government do something that the banks will not do?

Mr. DILL. Because the Government is in a world war, and it is the business of this country to raise all the food possible. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. The banks are interested in the winning of the war, are they not?

Mr. DILL. Yes; but they can not loan out the money under the State laws controlling banking, nor with safety to their stockholders. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] suggests, they are in the business of banking for the purpose of making money. The Government is going into this business for the purpose of producing food to win the war.

Mr. KEARNS. The banks of that section of the country are a part of the Government, are they not?

Mr. DILL. Oh, no.

Mr. KEARNS. They are interested in it.

Mr. DILL. Yes; they are interested in it. I have no complaints to make against the banks in this regard, because I doubt whether it would be advisable, from a business standpoint, for the banks to loan money on such security. I do not support this bill from a business standpoint, but I do support it from a patriotic standpoint. [Applause.] We can not afford to haggle and delay at a time like this. We must act, and act in the manner that will result in the production of as much wheat as possible.

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not know that I can add very much to what I said in the discussion of this question while the rule was being considered, but I have such a deep conviction as to the wrong that is about to be done and as to the farce that is about to be perpetrated that I rise for the second time to enter my protest against this kind of legislation. [Applause.] I stated in my speech before that the Secretary of Agriculture opposed the original Baer bill when it was before the Committee on Agriculture. I stand here to reaffirm that he opposed that bill and said it was not a good proposition and not good business, and advocated that it be not reported out of that committee, and no member of that committee will dispute my statement. This is a revamp of the original Baer bill, cutting down the amount from \$50,000,000 to \$10,000,000, because they think they can get \$10,000,000 through. That is all there is to it. But it is the same principle, and the committee killed that Baer bill when it was considered before. Now, how did they camouflage and get it back into the committee and on the floor of this House? They did it by inserting one new proposition. That proposition is a mobilization of labor. God knows we have got a Labor Department down here. We have given them millions of dollars to do the very work that this \$2,500,000 is supposed to do. Here you come and offer to duplicate that expenditure and have another force of employees camouflaging in this bill by bringing a new item into it in order to offer a \$7,500,000 proposition to loan money to 166,666 people to make a crop this year. There are just 30 more days in which to plant spring wheat, and another body has got to pass on this bill. Are you fooling yourselves? Are you not intelligent men? Do you not know that this bill can not pass the other body, if they were favorably disposed to it, and then this machinery be set in motion to loan to 166,666 people \$450 apiece to buy wheat to sow on their land? I will tell you

what is the truth. Why do you not go and do like Texas did? Our legislature appropriated millions in order to relieve the drought-stricken section of that State, where 144 counties were stricken barren. That is the course that ought to be pursued. Oh, I have a feeling for the people in the drought-stricken section, but that feeling can not run away with me and make me violate a governmental principle and perform a farce in this House in saying that we are going to give you \$7,500,000.

I believe in raising this wheat, and here is a sensible proposition. The Secretary of the Treasury will back every one of these banks down there with public funds, as he has done in the industrial centers, and as he has done in my State to relieve the cattlemen who have lost their all, but he made the banks get behind these loans, and he makes it a banking proposition, so that the Government will not lose one dollar of the money, and it will be paid back because these banks back up that credit; and let me tell you a man who is worthy of credit in the country where I come from, and I believe it is true of every other section of the United States, is able now, if he is honest and industrious, to go to his local banks and borrow money with which to buy seed in order to raise a crop. You talk about the bankers not being patriotic. They are patriotic.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. They are patriotic and they will advance this money if the man on the farm is worthy of the credit, because in order that the bank may succeed, the country in which they are located must succeed. I yield.

Miss RANKIN. Has the gentleman any bank in a homestead district in his State that can loan \$1,000,000 to the farmers?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. We have no homestead districts in my State, but it does not change the principle of the thing. I take it that in the homestead districts the banks are anxious that the homesteaders shall succeed, because, unless they do succeed, the banks ultimately will have to go out of business.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman please explain the difference between the principle involved in this bill and the principle involved in appropriating every year \$500,000 for the eradication of the Texas cattle tick? [Applause]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. If the gentleman can see any comparison between the two items, he sees more than any other person in this House can see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor, and especially when we are at war, as we are now, and when food is so important to the winning of that war, of the Government aiding the farmers as liberally as possible in producing the maximum of foodstuffs of which the soil is capable. Indeed, at the risk of being called a paternalist, I will say that I think the subject of agriculture is so important to the country, not alone in war times but in peace times as well, that I am in favor of still larger appropriations for the distribution of seeds and the dissemination of literature to aid in their proper planting and cultivation. But, Mr. Chairman, returning to this bill and having in mind the discrimination and sectionalism which it embodies, I wish to say that I believe in equal rights to all and exclusive privileges to none. I am that much of a Jeffersonian Democrat. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will not. The gentleman ought to know that he should not seek to interrupt me when I have such a brief time allotted me.

This bill in its present shape reminds me of what a fellow said to his partner who had charge of the cash register and who was using too much of the net profits of the concern. When the other partner complained about that, he said, "Oh, that will be all right in the end. We are in cahoots, you know"; to which the complaining partner replied: "Yes; I know we are in cahoots, but the hell of it is that you are getting the money and I am getting the cahoots." [Laughter.]

This bill as it now stands gives all of the benefit to you fellows who are in the spring-wheat areas, while we of the corn belt are getting the cahoots. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of amending this bill so as to include Kentucky, which I beg to remind you is still one of the States of the Union. [Applause and laughter.] We raise comparatively little wheat in Kentucky, and what we do raise we sow in the fall of the year. We raise some buckwheat, and if I have a chance I believe I will offer an amendment to strike out the word "spring" and insert the word "buck."

[Laughter.] That would come nearer to helping us in Kentucky if the bill is to be confined to the current year. We raise a good deal of tobacco in Kentucky, too, and we also raise some cane in spots. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. And some rye?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; and some rye, too. [Laughter.] But our great staple is corn, and I shall not vote for this bill unless it is amended so as to include corn, because we are short of seed corn there, especially in the mountain section, and my information is that the price of good seed corn is practically prohibitive. There is another reason why I think this bill should include the loaning of money to farmers for the purchase of seed corn, and that is that I think our soldier boys who are over there fighting for us are entitled to the very best of everything. [Applause.] I am in favor of them having biscuit and all of the wheat bread they can eat. Corn bread is good enough for us back here, and I am in favor of us eating corn bread exclusively here at home in order that we may be able to send more wheat "over there." The best way to accomplish that is to amend this bill so that our farmers may be able to purchase more seed corn, which is so scarce in Kentucky and other sections of the country, and thereby enable our farmers to raise more corn, not to be used in producing what Kentucky formerly utilized a great deal of corn for, because the old Commonwealth is going dry pretty soon, but to raise it in order that we may be able to send all of our wheat across the sea to our allies and our soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is only one excuse for this kind of legislation, and that is the Nation's extreme necessity for more bread material. We are the food providers of the civilized world to-day. A few millions of bushels of wheat or corn may mean the winning or losing of this war. The President, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hoover, the Food Director, and the members of the great Agricultural Committee say that this is a war measure of great and imperative importance, and I shall support it on the theory that it is a war measure.

Complaint has been made here by certain Members that this bill means that the Government will take a large part of the \$7,500,000 appropriated and lend it to grain growers without the usual kind of a security which good business men would require. I do not attempt to justify the passage of this bill to enable the Government to go into the business of buying and selling seed or lending money to grain growers and taking a lien upon their crop as security as a banking or money-lending proposition, but as a means of increasing the bread supply of the world, which in my judgment is the most important factor in winning the war if it lasts any considerable length of time.

But, gentlemen, I personally think you could justify the passage of this act better if you did not make it so sectional in its provisions. It is true you have cut out the words "in the spring-wheat areas" and made its provisions apply to the whole Nation; but since it only applies to the crop of the year 1918 and only provides for wheat, barley, and oats, it will have little other application than to the districts where spring wheat is planted.

I have proposed an amendment to the first section of the bill, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and sell either on time or credit, as he deems best, seed corn in the corn belt of the United States. If any of you gentlemen know any good reason why you should not include seed corn in the districts of the United States where last year's corn crop was frost bitten to the extent of 75 per cent I would like to hear it.

Some one has said that there is already an appropriation to take care of the seed question. If this is true, and if that appropriation is adequate, then why the necessity of this bill for the spring-wheat area? That argument affects this whole bill and should not be used alone against one section of the country any more than another.

And while we are on the subject I want to say to you that you have not treated the farmer of the great Middle West fairly in this and the last session of Congress. The farmers of my district and State are patriotic and are not opposed to their sons going to the battle front to fight in this death struggle for the life of this Republic. They would resent congressional action that would deny to them the privilege of sharing in the glory of this great cause. I think, and many of them think, that there are instances where boys have been taken from farms who could have served their country best following the plow. Congress authorized the President to exempt farmer boys from the draft where they were essential to the conduct of the operation of the farm. In some communities

little, if any, regard was given by exemption boards to this important question. Thousands of young men sorely needed to produce bread are now in the training camps. The cry for farm help is heard on every hand; and I am told that back in my district in Indiana, in every county, auctioneers are busy selling farm implements and farm stock, and that there is great fear that the farmers will not be enabled to produce as much grain as they have been accustomed to producing. Since the world is looking to us for food it is unfortunate if this condition actually exists.

Practically everyone agrees that in instances where boys are essential to the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of this year's crop they should be furloughed and permitted to go home and do this important work before taking up further military duties. By a unanimous vote, as I remember it, two weeks ago we passed a bill authorizing the Secretary of War, under rules and regulations to be made by him, to furlough this class of boys. I have worn the soles off of my shoes and worn out a couple of telephones, figuratively speaking, in the different war departments, trying to find out if there is going to be any rules and regulations made for furloughing these boys, and gentlemen, I finally gave up in despair. No one in any of the war departments knew anything about whether such provisions and arrangements were being made, and I venture the assertion that no such arrangement will be made. The President signed the bill, although I am informed that The Adjutant General prepared and submitted a brief in an attempt to prevent him from doing so. The General Staff is against it. This is not a political matter; the General Staff are only looking to the question of getting an army together. We are trying to look not only to the question of getting an army together, but to raise food to feed them and all of our people and our allies. If they delay much longer, it will be too late to do the farmer any good. He ought to know what to depend upon now.

A large part of Indiana's last year's corn crop, which was frostbitten, was in the field in December and January. The Indiana Federal food director came over here, and the Hon. LINCOLN DIXON, my colleague, introduced a bill authorizing the distillation of this corn into alcohol to make war munitions out of. For some reason the bill never got out of committee, but after the corn had rotted in the field the President made an Executive order permitting it to be distilled.

The Federal food director in Indiana tells me that the seed-corn question in my State is acute. I fear that worthless seed will be planted, and if seed corn is selling for the fabulous prices reported I fear, in many instances, some good corn land will lie idle. If seed corn is imported into our State from territories north or south of us it may mature too early or too late. If my amendment is adopted, it will leave it up to the Secretary of Agriculture, probably through Mr. Christie or Dr. Barnard, of the Federal food commission of Indiana, to buy the right kind of seed corn, and then through the county councils or county agents get it to the right place at the right time. When I was on the farm I think we planted from 6 to 8 acres with 1 bushel of seed corn. It does not mean a great outlay of money, but it is important that the right kind of seed corn is thoroughly scattered among the corn growers of the Middle West. They ought to be distributing this seed corn now, and if this amendment passes I hope the Senate will quickly act upon this bill, and that it will be put into operation at once.

I am willing to help the great Northwest produce more wheat. I do not begrudge them the money the Government will lend them. If the wheat is planted and we never get the money back, it is, in my judgment, a good investment. About every appropriation made so far has missed the Middle West. I think it is time that you were giving a little consideration to the Mississippi Valley, and unless you adopt my amendment and give us an opportunity at once to get properly tested seed corn for our corn growers at actual cost to the Government, you are doing my people a grave injustice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, according to the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture in area production Kansas is 25 per cent short, Oklahoma is 20 per cent short, and Nebraska is 20 per cent short. I come from a congressional district that raises every year 42,000,000 bushels of corn, 11,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 22,000,000 bushels of oats, and yet I have seen the time in my life in which these same farmers that are producing these immense crops were mortgaging their crops to buy seeds. This is a question of shortage and of drought; it is not a question of sectionalism. In 1911 there were some five or six counties in the northwest part of my State that by reason of drought had a shortage of crops. We had a law

upon our statute books by which the county commissioners could loan to the farmers and take back a crop mortgage. I want to give you the experience of four counties in 1912. In Perkins County the commissioners loaned \$67,000 to 1,292 farmers, and there remains uncollected only \$5,700. Meade County loaned \$9,000 to 125 farmers, and only \$680 remain uncollected. In Pennington County they furnished 8,190 bushels to 117 farmers, and there has not been a dollar lost of the loans in that county. In Butte County \$10,000 was loaned to 200 farmers, and there remains only \$1,500 uncollected. It is a question of drought in certain sections of the country. You can not produce more winter wheat because the day has passed, but you can produce more spring wheat to feed our armies abroad. Now is the time to do it, and you can do it by granting the provisions of this bill. Out in some of these sections of the Northwest we have had droughts and they are unable to buy seed for cropping purposes. It was stated here by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] that there were 20,000 entrymen on homesteads under the homestead laws last year. Many of those people who have taken homesteads went out there without machinery, without teams, without credit, and without money. You can not raise anything the first year; it takes time to open up a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the gentleman be given a half a minute in order to ask a question. Sixty thousand homesteaders in Montana?

Mr. DILLON. I mean 20,000.

Mr. CANNON. But 60,000 throughout the United States; is that it?

Mr. DILLON. I do not know the number. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] made the statement there were 20,000 homesteaders last year in the State of Montana.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, my support of this measure will not be given it on the ground that I anticipate that this measure alone will win the war, but because I believe it is one that will help to win the war, and because it tends to recognize certain conditions that exist which this country must come to realize more clearly before we do win the war. In that winning we must have men, munitions, food, and ships. If we have not come to realize it yet, we will come to realize before this Nation is a year older that the question of a proper supply of food is not a question in which the farmer alone is interested. [Applause.] It is a question in which the whole Nation is interested; it is a question in which our allies are interested. This bill recognizes the idea that it is not improper, but is highly desirable for the Government to cooperate with the producer of foods to increase the food production the same as the Government cooperates with the producer of munitions or the producer of ships in order to increase the production thereof. In the production of munitions the Government will furnish a contract by which it agrees to furnish the materials and take the product. Under the finance bill recently passed by the House money will be advanced to such manufacturers. Such contracts give the manufacturer a sure thing that he will get a profit of 10 per cent upon the cost of those munitions. They say, of course the Government is sure of the munitions, and therefore can not lose. Even so. But the Government must stand all the wastage of time and material, and is not sure that after the munitions are produced it will want them. If there is a change of conditions it may not want those particular shells, but it will have them on its hands. Will anybody say that the possibility of such loss must prevent the Government from contracting for the munitions it must have and taking such course as will secure the greatest production? But food is just as great a necessity as ordnance or shells, and the prospect for a serious shortage for us and our allies is now dire and threatening.

These are not days for the slavish following of precedents. We must do the things necessary for the winning of the war. The fact that such things have not been done before, or that in peace times hereafter should not be repeated, should not deter such action by us if the thing proposed strengthens our resources or cements our forces for winning the war. Our present critical necessities must guide us.

The Government must encourage the farmer by needed cooperation in any feasible way to increase the production of food. If through this measure the Government happens to lose the cost of the seed, the farmer has lost his labor, the interest on his investment, and his year's efforts. The serious loss to the Government will be not the seed advance but the crop failure. It is to prevent such crop failure that the Government must take the chance. And if, on the other hand,

the Government through that small chance does increase the production of wheat by 100,000 acres or more, the Nation gets its return in that increase for the chance that it has taken. Personally I believe the time is close upon us when a greater share of the chances in food production must be taken by the Government in order to insure sufficient for our absolute necessities. Contracts out and out for production of food are as logical as contracts for production of clothing or ordnance, and are at this moment as necessary to the winning of the war. As yet the country has not realized it. Within a year stern necessity will teach us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is a question of favoring the citizens of Montana or North Dakota. The sole question is whether or not we shall set at work a potentially capable set of people who can not without this assistance render the best that is in them. The winter-wheat crop is not what the Government expected, either in acreage or quality. The one opportunity to increase for America and her allies wheat bread, which has been the war bread for thousands of years, is to increase the spring-wheat acreage. It will not affect my district. It will not affect my State, but it will affect several States where there are tens of thousands of homesteaders. And as the Government desires to make most efficient its soldiers in the field it ought to render efficient the farmers wherever they lack the tools or the means.

I am somewhat familiar with the banking situation in the new parts of Montana, and I know the banks have loaned to their utmost capacity. And this is simply a loan you are making in your own interests to increase this wheat product. I have no doubt that if the Government will make these loans its losses will be very slight. I am confident that if we loan these few millions to the farmers of these Northwestern States we are just about as liable to have it paid as the loans we are making, not by millions, but by billions, to our allied friends in other countries. And while I trust the allies, their Governments, and their people, I would rather trust our friends in our neighboring States and expect to get full return from them than from people of whom we know but little. [Applause.]

I desire simply to say this, and ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record, that I believe by helping those people to-day we are helping the Government in obtaining that which during the coming year will be more efficacious than powder or shell. [Applause.] There has been some question about where this measure came from, or who are its sponsors. These questions do not strongly appeal to me. It is written in the English language. Its terms are understandable. Its purposes and objects are patriotic. It is recommended by the Agriculture Committee. I have in my service here voted for measures on a basis of their merits rather than their origin. I have heard no valid reason for opposing this bill. I expect to vote for it, because it is not a case of aiding Montana citizens. If that were the case, I should say, "Montana, do your duty." But Montana as a State is not at war. The United States is at war and needs the wheat. We should do our share in producing it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill, first, because one of the great committees of this House, after careful consideration, have reported in favor of it; second, I am in favor of it because it is for the purpose of aiding in the successful carrying on of this war; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that when we have those facts before us we ought to brush aside every other consideration, whether it affects our own locality or not, and look only to the welfare of the Nation at this hour, when our soldiers upon the battle fields of France to-day are fighting and giving up their lives to save the very Republic that we are here to serve. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and a letter I have just sent to the Clerk's desk, which I will ask to have read in my time, indicates very clearly the situation that obtains in regions where there has been drought.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FALLS, IDAHO, March 8, 1918.

HON. BURTON L. FRENCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Power County Farm Bureau, with the University of Idaho and the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating, has completed a survey for spring seeding. Over 700 farmers were ques-

tioned and individual reports secured covering over 200,000 acres of farm land in Power County. I beg to hand you herewith a partial summary of this survey:

Number of acres now seeded to fall wheat	95,411
Number of acres intended for spring seeding	59,910
Number of farmers who have no seed	269
Number of farmers who have some seed but not enough for requirements	179
Number of acres ready for seeding for which there is no seed in the farmers' hands	26,045
Number of farmers having no feed for work stock	179
Number of acres to be summer fallowed and seeded to wheat in fall of 1918	58,616

From a careful scrutiny of the above you will readily see that a serious condition exists in Power County. This condition is the result of three years of short crops due to drought. Many of the farmers are without funds to even buy the necessities of life, and, while a patriotic sentiment is evident and the people want to do all they can in the way of raising more wheat, the failures of the past three years in certain sections of Power County and the cash system that now prevails in purchase of supplies have put many of them in a position where they must have financial assistance to carry them through another crop period. The banks here are anxious to help but the situation is a little beyond them, and we must have outside help, either from the State or Federal Government. The time is short. The facts are known. The seed wheat is available if funds can be secured to move it. Many of the farmers will be compelled to desert their farms and go to work in the shops or elsewhere unless immediate action is taken to prevent it.

There should be at least \$250,000 deposited in the banks of Power County to be loaned to the farmers needing help upon the recommendation of the farm bureau and county council of defense after thorough investigation and inquiry into each individual case.

What do you think can be done?

Very truly, yours,

POWER COUNTY FARM BUREAU.
By JOHN R. WRIGHT, Secretary.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, this letter is from Power County, one of the counties in Idaho that is farmed for the most part by dry-farm methods. The same condition exists in some other belts where dry farming prevails. The letter is clear-cut and tells in striking manner of a situation that this bill will relieve.

Several objections have been made to the bill. It is objected that it is too late to do good. Gentlemen, it is not too late if we act now and if the Senate will immediately ratify the bill.

It is objected that the machinery can not be put into motion that will meet the situation with promptness. The letter that I have had read indicates the careful survey of one county. I have no doubt that somewhat similar surveys have been made in almost every region that is in need of help. Through those surveys and with the aid of the agents of the Agricultural Department and the members of the county councils of national defense we shall have the machinery at hand with which to proceed with the work under the bill.

Again, it is objected that the idea is novel and would be a bad precedent. Do we forget that even in days of peace we have spent millions to fight the boll weevil of Texas? That we have spent millions to aid the sufferers through floods in the Ohio and the Mississippi Valleys? That time and again when disaster has visited one section of our country or another our Nation has helped as a Nation to bear the burden? Well, that is in part what is proposed here. The regions to be benefited are regions that have suffered and where drought has greatly reduced or wiped out the normal yield of grain. In normal times this loss could be borne locally. To-day the price of seed is high, the cost of farm machinery has been tremendously advanced, labor can be had at only a high wage. The farmer who has suffered through drought can not bear the burden alone.

But if this legislation would be justified in days of peace, how much more imperative is it now? The farmer is not the only one interested. The country is interested, the world depends upon food, and as a war emergency this bill should pass.

To provide advances of money for the purchase of grain is only one feature of the bill.

There is another feature. The bill provides that \$2,500,000 shall be made available for mobilization and distribution of farm labor; and, as important as is the first feature of the bill, I am inclined to think that this feature is more important.

From all over my district I am receiving letters calling attention to the labor problem. Farmers are working hard to meet the situation, but they are discouraged. Here is a letter from Mr. G. H. Brayton, of Jerome, Idaho, the chairman of the Lincoln County Farm Bureau, from which I quote:

There are many thousands of acres in this county that within the last 10 years have been reclaimed from the desert and put under cultivation, at the cost of from \$25 to \$50 per acre, that are going to be abandoned during 1918 for the want of labor or on account of the increased cost of the same.

This letter is one of many, and our Government must bend every energy to locate available labor and then to place it. An officer of the Department of Labor told me this morning of 3,000 men in one small city who have been thrown out of employment, but whom the department will place where they will be needed with little delay. He told me of another 200 men whose work terminated on Saturday night and who through the aid of the

department went to work the next Monday morning in another city.

I mention these two cases to show that already the Government is a clearing house for labor. It will become more important as such. In one region is a dearth of labor, in another are idle men. Let us provide an agency that will bring the two together, and that, in fact, is what is contemplated in the bill for the farmers of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. There is one point which I do not believe has been brought out. Now, this is largely for the aid of wheat farmers. It does not cost but a trifle, so to speak, to furnish seed for a field of corn. But an ordinary wheat farmer in the western country may plant from 200 to 300 acres of wheat. It will cost from \$300 to \$500 to furnish seed for that crop, and when you are in a section where wheat is the chief crop and there has been a failure of wheat the local banks do not have the money to furnish the credit to buy the necessary seed wheat, because in a year when there has been a wheat failure that affects the credit of the local banks. A year ago we passed the food-survey bill. In the form in which that bill passed the House there was a provision which provided that the Secretary of Agriculture might furnish seed to farmers on credit and to any section of the Union when conditions made it necessary.

Mr. GORDON. For cash.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; not for cash, but on credit. And when that bill went to the Senate for some reason unknown to me that provision was struck out of the bill. This House never had a right to vote on that proposition. I do not know who is responsible for taking that out. If that provision had been left in the bill whereby the Secretary of Agriculture could have helped the farmers of western Oklahoma and western Kansas and western Nebraska in purchasing seed wheat, we would have had several million additional acres of wheat growing to-day. I am surprised that some gentlemen in this House look upon this bill as merely a special favor to wheat farmers. It would aid some poor farmers, but the chief thing is it would aid the Nation; it would mean more wheat and more bread, and would strengthen us and our allies and aid us to win the war.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, supplementing what my colleague has said with reference to the needs of the farmers of Idaho in the dry-farm sections, I wish to read two telegrams, the first from R. J. Leth, the State seed commissioner, as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, March 22, 1918.

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

How soon can relief for farmers unable to purchase seed wheat in northeast Idaho be expected? Wheat in given section too foul to pass State law.

That is, the seed which they have raised in the eastern part of the State can not be used because it is unfit for seed and it is necessary to purchase seed from outside. He says further:

Must buy elsewhere to insure passable seed. Farmers unable to pay cash. Immediate action imperative. Please wire reply.

R. J. LETH,
State Seed Commissioner.

I have also the following telegram from the chairman of the farm market bureau:

BOISE, IDAHO, March 14, 1918.

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred thousand dollars now set aside by Idaho Bankers' Association to loan farmers for buying seed. Two counties alone have already called for \$250,000. Five hundred farmers or more would be benefited in wheat alone.

HARVEY ALLRED,
Chairman Farm Market Bureau.

I yield back the balance of my time. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this bill seemingly do not understand its purpose or the conditions which demand it. The purpose of the legislation proposed is to help the farmers throughout the country, to enable them to produce for the Nation more food-stuffs, to do the very thing that the Nation needs and wants done.

There is no man who has made any study of this question during the past few months but knows that in the Nation to-day and in the world there is a great shortage of wheat. We are not, in passing this legislation, doing more for the farmer than we are doing to-day for other industries. While we are supplying in the lumber regions money to lumbermen and contractors to build railroads and wagon roads, while we are advancing to them money sufficient to meet every expense connected with cutting down and getting out timber for aeroplane construction and shipbuilding, and while in addition we are furnishing enlisted men to do much of this work is it unreasonable to ask the Government to supply credit to needy farmers in the spring wheat growing section of the country to assist them to procure seed wheat so they may put in a maximum crop acreage of spring wheat during the next six or eight weeks? If we are to give credence to the official reports which reach us from our Food Administration and from the food administrators of France and England, an increased production of wheat during the coming season is not much less important than an increased production of aeroplanes and of ships. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that there is no need to advance this money and no necessity to make these contracts with farmers for increased wheat production, then the money appropriated in the bill will not be used.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] that I quite agree with him in his suggestion that the appropriation here is not large enough. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture should have come into this House with a broad, comprehensive plan for increased food production throughout the Nation. I believe he should have come to Congress and asked for \$100,000,000 to be available to the Department of Agriculture to help every agricultural section of the country, and to encourage to the largest possible extent increased food production in every section of the country where the aid of the Agricultural Department would accomplish this. The Secretary of Agriculture has not yet awakened to the real needs of the Nation and of our allies in the war for greater food production this year. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] that if this bill is soon enacted into law and it results in increasing the production of wheat even a few millions of bushels his constituents in Cleveland may not be so hungry next winter as they are likely to be if there is a shortage of food products in this country this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Would you lend this money without any security at all?

Mr. NORTON. I would lend it on the best security that can be given, and that is the security and the certain assurance that the farmers to whom it is advanced or loaned will cheerfully and patriotically invest their time, their labor, their skill, their experience, and the use of their lands and all their expensive farm machinery and equipment in an earnest endeavor, combined with nature, to produce for you and other citizens of the Nation more wheat, which is so greatly needed to be ground into flour, which experience has shown is the very staff of the Nation's life.

Mr. GORDON. But you would have to buy them in order to get them to do this. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. That statement is gratuitous. It is unjust and unworthy of the gentleman. The farmers in the spring-wheat growing sections of the country do not have to be bought or subsidized by anyone to cooperate to the very maximum of their power, ability, and resources with the Government in this crucial time of our Nation's life. Without this aid that is being asked for they will do all that lies within their power and resources in the production of food products; with this aid given them they can and will be able to do more for the Nation. They want to do more. The President, the Food Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture tell them that more wheat is needed to be produced this year in this country than it appears now will be produced. The food administrators of Belgium, of France, of England, and of Italy are calling upon them to produce this year every possible bushel of wheat that can be produced. In the face of this will anyone in this House vote to deny them this pittance of assistance and encouragement which

will enable them to respond more fully to the demands for greater wheat production which is being made upon them by this Nation and by all the nations with which we are allied in this war? In view of the facts presented by the very able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in support of this measure it seems to me that the measure should have the immediate and unanimous support of this committee and of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rubey] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Ragsdale].

Mr. RAGSDALE. I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Shallenberger].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for one minute.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this measure because it is reported from the great Committee on Agriculture as a military measure, and I believe it to be such. The men at the front can not fight unless they are fed. I do not expect that we shall win this war with "dough," either wheat or financial, but I recognize that both are munitions of war, and because I believe the increased production of wheat is essential in the prosecution of the war and the chairman believes this bill will help in that direction I am for it. Because I believe that the labor engaged in agriculture and every other form of essential war industry is a vital factor in the situation that confronts the country and for the further reason that it is a bill that will affect all labor in the country in the gravest degree I am for it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert certain matter in the Record for the information of the House. As most of the Members know, a bill has been reported from the Military Committee which proposes to change fundamentally present law for determining the basis of obtaining the quotas called from draft districts under the draft law. The minority of the committee have directed me to prepare an amendment, which I will offer to that bill. When it is up for consideration before the House I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the change in present law proposed in the new legislation, and the amendment which I expect to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record the subject matter indicated in his statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT AS TO PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE DRAFT LAW.

S. J. Res. 123, which has passed the Senate and has been reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the House and referred to the House Calendar, providing for certain changes in the present draft law for calling men into the military service under the terms of the act of Congress of May 18, 1917, after defining the act to be amended upon the first page, provides, on page 2 of the resolution as printed, as follows:

"No provision of said act shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act, in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act; or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing."

It will be noted that the resolution as reported changes the basis of the quotas from population as it is in existing law and bases it upon the number of persons placed in any class or classes. The amendment proposed by Mr. Shallenberger and which is printed below for the information of Members of the House proposes to base the quotas upon the number of persons liable for military service in the draft districts as determined by the registration of persons so liable when the same has been completed by the War Department.

Amendment as proposed by Mr. SHALLENBERGER: On page 2, line 5, strike out all after the word "act," down to and including the word "act," at the end of line 8, and in line 11, after the period, at the end of the bill, add the following:

"Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, called under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, shall hereafter be determined in proportion to the total number of persons registered and liable for military service therein, including resident aliens who have waived all claims for exemption, and credit shall be given on its quotas to any State Territory, District, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who have entered the military service of the United States from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof since April 1, 1917, including members of the National Guard who were in Federal service on that date."

The amendment proposed above continues the provisions of existing law, which allows credit for volunteers, which the Senate resolution, if enacted without amendment, will no longer permit.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is just one more minute left of this general debate. I yield that minute to the chairman of the committee, the little giant from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in the minute remaining I desire to say that many Members, talking to me personally, have made objection to section 2 of this bill, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to secure the voluntary mobilization and distribution of farm labor. No one seems to object to the idea of mobilizing farm labor and utilizing it to the best advantage in this country, but there seems to be some fear that the Secretary of Agriculture might be given the power to go into a State and very largely take from that State labor that should be used in the State. My colleague [Mr. STEVENSON] has prepared an amendment which he has submitted to me, which I think makes it absolutely certain that that kind of thing can not happen. When the bill is read under the five-minute rule for amendment, if my colleague [Mr. STEVENSON] will offer that amendment, as I am sure he will, I shall have no objection to it, and I think that will relieve all objection to this section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

By unanimous consent Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. NORTON, Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, and Mr. RUBEN were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers in spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes, or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each such farmer to use the seed thus to be obtained by him for the production of grain during the crop season of 1918. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450. All such advances or loans shall, as far as practicable, be made through the agency of State and National banks. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500,000, available immediately.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 1, page 2, the words "spring wheat."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HELVERING offers an amendment, on page 2, line 1, to strike out the words "spring wheat."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. Are we considering the resolution or the bill introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER]?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is considering the substitute bill, contained in House resolution 281.

Mr. NORTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORTON. Under the rule the bill H. R. 7795 is not being considered. The only bill being considered is the bill that is written in the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The text of the bill is contained in the rule.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. I do not know how much time gentlemen may want on it, but I should like to sound out the committee to ascertain how much time is desired on this one amendment to strike out the words "spring wheat."

I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this pending amendment may be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. This is a matter about which there is a great deal of controversy.

Mr. LEVER. At the request of gentlemen around me, I will modify my request and ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the gentleman will not press that.

Mr. LEVER. Make it 45 minutes, then.

Mr. CANNON. There has been no discussion on this. It is too early to fix a limit.

Mr. ROBBINS. Some members of the committee have talked two or three times. I want five minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will modify my request by asking that the debate on this pending amendment shall close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. There has been no consideration of the pending amendment. Let it run a while and see.

Mr. LEVER. I will modify my request further by asking unanimous consent that debate on this pending amendment, the importance of which I recognize, shall close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Does that cover other amendments?

Mr. LEVER. No; just this amendment.

Mr. NORTON. There has been no debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from South Carolina is made pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING], who is entitled to the floor for five minutes. Will the gentleman from South Carolina please state his request?

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] may close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Who is to control the time?

Mr. BAER. How is the time to be controlled?

Mr. LEVER. The Chair to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we are considering the bill as printed or the resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. House resolution 281, reported by the Committee on Rules, contains the bill that is under consideration.

Mr. HELVERING. Therefore my statement of the page and line where my amendment occurs is correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, my object in offering this amendment is to make available this fund for the purpose of securing greater production of cereals necessary for the feeding of the people of this country. I realize that the greater part of this money undoubtedly will be used in the spring-wheat area, yet oats and barley as well as wheat are very necessary to be produced. It is very necessary that they be produced at this time.

There are large areas where spring wheat is not raised where this money might be used to advantage. I do not expect that any appreciable amount of money expended under the first provision of this bill will be expended in my State, yet I believe that if it becomes important that the people of that State may be furnished seed to produce oats, barley, or wheat, not being in the spring-wheat area, they should be given the same privilege as people who live in the spring-wheat area. Therefore I make the motion to strike out the words "spring wheat," so that this bill will provide that the loans may be made to the farmers in any area of the United States when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find special need for furnishing seed for agricultural purposes. I realize that it is necessary to stimulate production. I believe that without the necessary increase in production in this country one of the most important factors in winning the war will be eliminated; that is, the proper furnishing of foods for our people. I would like to see this bill with this amendment, and such other amendments as may be offered that the House decides will improve the bill, adopted at an early time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman object to modifying his amendment so as to strike out the word "areas"? That would provide wherever you can find a farmer that can make good or who ought to be given a chance, irrespective of an investigation, whether there is an area or not.

Mr. HELVERING. I would have no objection to that, except that I understand the department in administering this act wants it to be in areas sufficient to justify the Secretary of Agriculture in considering it. I do not think the Secretary would be justified in considering an isolated case of one farmer.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose a man furnishes the security, ought he not to have the right to have oats and barley for seed the same as those where there is a large area that is easily accessible?

Mr. HELVERING. I think the gentleman is correct, but whether it would be logical or practical I do not know.

Mr. RAKER. The Secretary is not going to send an expert to determine in advance whether he is going to make the loan, is he?

Mr. HELVERING. I do not know.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. In the confusion I could not understand the gentleman's amendment. Does his amendment mean that this relief is applicable to any farmer in any part of the State that needs the relief?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes; in any part of the United States. Everyone concedes the necessity for increased production. There is no question about that. I do not think there is a man in the House who questions the advisability of facilitating production if we can possibly do it, but I believe this should be universal. Therefore I submit to your fair consideration that the Secretary of Agriculture should be allowed to furnish this help at any place in the United States where he thinks it is necessary.

From all sides we hear the cry that there is an urgent need for an increase in our wheat production, and wheat is needed not alone by our men in the Army and by the civilian population at home, but it is of vital necessity to the soldiers and to the civilians who are united with us in a gigantic struggle against a common enemy.

The resolution now before us seeks to increase production. It seeks to enable us to grow needed crops where the chances are that no crops will be grown unless this Congress takes action. The individual farmer may have all of the patriotism in the world, and he may be as anxious as you and I are to do his full share in behalf of the country, but the individual farmer is powerless if he has only the land and lacks the means to secure the seed and the labor to attend to the planting, to the care, and to the harvesting of a crop.

The need of seed on the part of those who are unable to buy it, either because of lack of finance or lack of supply, is a need which we should take care of now. Every agency of this Government should be utilized in seeing to it that the supply shall meet every demand, and if we can be so considerate of "big business" that we can afford to make financial advances on contracts for war material, surely we can show equal consideration for the little fellow by making a limited advance to enable him to utilize available land in the production of crops which are absolutely necessary in the successful conduct of the war.

But it will be a waste of money and a waste of our resources if we merely provide seed and make it impossible for the farmers to take care of the crop. I have been and am a firm believer in the selective draft as the fairest and the best method of raising an army; but in the operation of that law it is certain that essential farm labor will be taken. We know that this has been done, and no matter how careful we may be in administering the law hereafter along the lines now laid down, and I want to stop long enough to say that the method now adopted should have been put in force at the start, nevertheless what has already been done is certain to curtail production unless we extend needed aid in legislation here.

And what is it that we are asked to do? Merely to give authorization for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor and its distribution, to the end that essential farming activities may be aided. In order to do this we will have to advance railroad fares and other traveling expenses, but rules and regulations can be made so that this expense will be a loan and not a gift, and in the end it will not be a direct charge upon the Treasury.

Gentlemen, this is cheap insurance which we are called upon to buy. It is the insuring of our future agricultural production, and without that production we will paralyze all of our war work. The farmers of the country are not asking this Congress for charity. They have listened to our plea that an increase of production is necessary in order to win this war. They have given heed to that plea, and they are behind our Army and our Navy prepared to do everything that Americans can do to hold up the hands of the fighting forces and to supply the things which are so urgently called for. But they call attention to their limitations, physical limitations, for there can be no limitation of their spirit of patriotism or desire to help, and they ask us to aid them in securing the seed and the labor, without which they can do nothing. It is for us to answer them by our votes here and show to them that we will do all that human effort can do to aid them in this work, and thus with our cooperation they will be able to do their full part in the work of winning this war and in preserving all which America holds dear.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection; and the Clerk again reported the Helvering amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to that amendment in the way of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the members of the committee that if they will send to the Clerk's desk and obtain a copy of House resolution 281, reported by the Committee on Rules, they will find therein the bill now being considered by the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. The clerks are distributing H. R. 7795, and the amendments do not fit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. When this bill is passed and has been sent over to the Senate, will it be in the form of House resolution 281 or as H. R. 7795?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it will be sent as H. R. 7795.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then ought we not to consider H. R. 7795, as amended by the Committee on Agriculture? In offering amendments it strikes me they ought to be offered to the text of the bill as reported by the committee. The rule merely provided for considering the substitute, and the fact that it is set out fully in the rule does not change the rule that amendments ought to be offered to the bill as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that amendments should be offered to H. R. 7795.

Mr. HELVERING. In that case I would have to modify my amendment and make it apply to line 15, page 3, of H. R. 7795.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the modification will be so made.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between my amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] is that he wants to limit this by areas. My amendment, if adopted, would make the text read "to farmers of the United States." Then it would be available to any farmer anywhere in the United States, regardless of whether he was in a drought area or otherwise.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman's amendment been reported?

Mr. WINGO. Yes. It is to line 16, on page 3, of the bill we are now considering. I will say that I am going to vote for this bill, although I do not think it is absolutely necessary, and I shall only vote for it because it is contended by some gentlemen that in their districts there are isolated cases where some farmers, by reason of some extraordinary distress or by reason of lack of ordinary credit facilities, as in homestead areas, for illustration, who can not get the ordinary accommodations now available to farmers in other parts of the country.

That they can not get the benefit of the provisions of the Federal reserve act, that they can not get the benefit of the provision which has been included in one of the appropriation bills by which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to spend millions for seed and sell them to farmers at cost. I am going to vote for it, because I can recognize there are some instances here and there of a peculiar character which the Secretary, through proper agencies, could give relief under this bill where he finds it. But, most of all, I am in favor of my amendment because the legislation is general and not sectional. Now, I am not going to vote for the bill for the same reason that 90 per cent of the gentlemen are going to vote for it. I regret argument made upon this floor by which continually the farmer is made, or tried to be made, to believe that we are taking care of everybody else under the sun except the farmer. There is a propaganda going over this country, as I stated the other day, to mislead the farmer into the belief that we are granting relief to everybody and we are not doing anything for him. I repeat what I said then. When we passed the Federal reserve act he was given better provision for his paper upon longer terms than the manufacturer or the merchant. In addition to that, we passed the farm-loan act to take care of his long-time capital needs. In one of the appropriation bills we gave to the Secretary of Agriculture millions of dollars to spend on seeds that may be needed to supply the farmers. In the great Agricultural appropriation bill, which the able gentleman from South Carolina brings into the House every session, we make extraordinary provisions, and there is not a desire by any man in this House, whether coming from a city district or a farming district, to neglect the farmer of the United States or not to do anything that is necessary, proper, practicable, and feasible to try to build up the farming industry of this country, and I, for one, decry the propaganda that is going around trying to make the farmer believe that we are not making earnest efforts to meet his needs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, has debate been exhausted on this amendment? The substitute is not in order until the end of the 20 minutes' debate.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no time limit fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Oklahoma will withhold until the pending amendment is disposed of—

Mr. MORGAN. But this is a substitute for the pending amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. My amendment is an amendment in the nature of a substitute and the gentleman can not offer a substitute for a substitute.

Mr. MORGAN. I offered it as a substitute for the amendment, and I understood the gentleman to offer his amendment as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. I beg pardon; I offered it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment reported to see whether it is in order or not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 3, line 15, after the word "eighteen," insert the following words: "and nineteen and nineteen"; and in line 15 strike out the word "spring"; and in line 25 insert, after the word "eighteen," the following words: "and nineteen and nineteen."

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that the amendment is not a substitute nor an amendment to a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say, as far as the Chair is concerned, every effort will be exerted to see that every proposition that is in order is fairly considered, and the fact that the Chair ruled on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma simply means that it is not in order at this time.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for information. I have a right to know what the point of order against my substitute is. I wanted to know upon what grounds the gentleman raised the point of order, and I did not get the information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated, I regret the gentleman did not hear me, that the gentleman's amendment was not an amendment to a substitute. If the gentleman from Arkansas offers his amendment as a substitute, it is in order to offer an amendment to the substitute. There are four processes in different parliamentary stages that are all well known. An amendment may be offered as an amendment to that amendment; a substitute to the principal amendment, and an amendment to the substitute. Now, the gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment—

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not; I am addressing the Chair by the privilege of the Chair. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment. The gentleman from Arkansas offers, as he states, a substitute to the amendment. Now, it is in order to offer either an amendment to the original amendment of the gentleman from Kansas or an amendment to the substitute, but the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is not either.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment as a substitute for both the amendments. Now, I should think that would be in order. That is the way I offered it.

The CHAIRMAN. For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Chair was compelled to hold that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma was not in order at this stage of the proceedings. The Chair will endeavor to deal with every proposition as presented to the committee and see that it is acted upon at some stage of the proceedings.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment, then, to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING]—an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. CANNON. That is not in order. I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not germane to that amendment at all. The gentleman will get his time later on this proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. I will, if I insist on it, I suppose.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendments be closed in five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LEVER. I move that the debate on the pending amendments be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that debate on the pending amendments close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the purport of the amendments of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Arkansas is, in effect, to spread the area over which these purchases and advances may be made. Now, I want to say very frankly to the committee that if either of these amendments prevail I shall vote against this bill. The Committee on Agriculture did not bring this bill in here as a "pork-barrel" proposition. We brought it upon the theory that there was a section of the country, limited in area, where by doing certain things we might increase the acreage in wheat by 3,000,000 acres.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Now, these gentlemen intend to take the bridle off. And while we in South Carolina raise a very limited amount of wheat, my South Carolina farmer will be coming here, probably, to ask for his share of the "swill." The Committee on Agriculture does not regard this appropriation as "swill" at all. We look upon it as something vital in the winning of this war, and if I thought that this House, thinking only of local conditions, was going to run away with this bill to the extent of taking the bridle off, increasing these appropriations regardlessly and only upon the theory that "my State wants its share," I would not be a party to that kind of legislation.

I want to beg the members of this committee as earnestly as I can to vote down these amendments, because it puts the Congress of the United States in an attitude which it can not afford to assume in the eyes of patriotic people in this country. I had hoped that these amendments would not be offered. I had hoped it for the reason that I know how strongly men feel when they have got to defend themselves in their district against the fact that they did not get "their share of it." Gentlemen, there is not any "share-of-it" proposition in this bill. [Applause.] If I thought there was, I would vote against it if I never got another vote in my district for Congress or any other position. I want to beg the men here to stand with the committee and limit this so that they can go to their constituents feeling that this is not a grab-bag proposition, but that it was regarded by the Congress of the United States as a vital proposition in the winning of this war. Will you do it? I hope you will. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If this bill was limited to furnishing seed alone I might agree with the gentleman, but what reason is there for furnishing oats and barley seed to this area of spring wheat?

Mr. LEVER. For the reason that this area was struck by a drought and for the further reason that there is no more speculative section for farm purposes in the world than this country, and for the further reason that we can now at this moment sow oats and barley in this area. You can not do it practically anywhere else and get the best yield.

Mr. BLAND. The administration of this law, after all, is left to the Secretary of Agriculture, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. That is very true. But let me say this: I think this House has gone exceedingly far in trusting administrative officers. Are we not in a position to say how far we ought to go and how far we do not want to go in this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes?

Mr. CANNON. There is another amendment in the way of a substitute. Debate is not closed on the substitute to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. There is no substitute pending.

Mr. CANNON. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will permit, I think I can straighten the situation out. My motion was to close debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Arkansas, and that was carried.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; although I have not the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand that to those gentlemen in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas all debate is cut off and that we have no time on that proposition?

Mr. LEVER. The committee did that. I was not responsible.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman made the motion.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order to ask a question.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied that the gentleman will get opportunity to interrogate me a little later on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee voted to close debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas and the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. CANNON. I move to strike out the last word of the substitute for the second amendment.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the fact that the House has voted to close debate in five minutes preclude me from asking for time by unanimous consent of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. LEVER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on these two amendments is closed.

Mr. CANNON. But there is a substitute pending for the second amendment.

Mr. LEVER. A point of order was sustained on that. Later I made a point of order and it was sustained.

Mr. CANNON. Let us appeal to the Clerk and see what is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] for one minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I couple with that a request to speak for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let us find out the status at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING], and also the amendment in the way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HELVERING: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "spring wheat."

Substitute offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

Mr. HELVERING. Upon those two amendments the debate was closed, as I understand, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the action of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Was it offered by way of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It was.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Illinois can amend the substitute by striking out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. That is what I propose to do. Does all debate close upon the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no desire to cut off anyone, but the Chair has no control over the action of the House.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will indulge me for a moment, I think the gentleman from Illinois realizes that I am endeavoring and trying to close the debate on these amendments which affect this particular proposition, not on the section.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. And the debate has been closed on the amendments and the substitute for the amendment. All debate has been closed on those. If the gentleman has an amendment which goes to one of these, I do not see how it could be in order because it would be a substitute, because there is a substitute pending, unless it might be an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. CANNON. I offer a pro forma amendment. The debate was not shut off by unanimous consent, as I understand it, to the substitute?

Mr. LEVER. The Chair differs, and I differ with the gentleman myself. The debate was closed on the amendment and the substitute, as I understand it.

Mr. SNELL. Regular order!

Mr. CANNON. This is a vital amendment, and I do not think the committee understands it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is there any amendment pending to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. Not that the Chair knows of.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then an amendment to the substitute is in order. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] shall have five minutes, within which to offer an amendment to the substitute and proceed in that time to discuss the same. That is in order. I ask unanimous consent that he shall have five minutes within which to offer an amendment to the substitute and discuss the same.

Mr. CANNON. I take it for five minutes; but I think your first proposition is correct, that an amendment to the substitute is in order.

Mr. LEVER. But the point is that the debate has been closed.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Even if the matter in debate has been closed, it is perfectly competent for this body, by unanimous consent, to give the gentleman from Illinois five minutes or any other time it chooses. The fact that the debate has been closed does not cut off the right from this body by unanimous consent to extend time. Of course, it is competent to anybody to object.

Mr. VENABLE. Does that apply to the gentleman from Mississippi as well as to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It applies to everybody.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] five minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] five minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The regular order is to put my request that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes in which to offer an amendment to the substitute and discuss the same. That is the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes in which to offer a substitute and discuss it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have sought recognition, but did not receive it, for which I have no complaint, because the members of a committee are always entitled to preference in the consideration of a bill, and, for that matter, preference in opportunity to offer amendments, and so forth. But I do want to talk a little about this bill. I do not know that I can say in five minutes what I want to say. But what is this proposition? This bill proposes at the expense of the United States Treasury to furnish wheat, oats, and barley for seed in spring-wheat territory for the crop of 1918.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will have to ask for a further extension of time. I want to be courteous, and I will be. I think the House will give me five minutes more.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What is "the spring-wheat district"? That is what I want to know. What is "a spring-wheat district," "a spring-wheat area"?

Mr. CANNON. I suppose that is a matter of fact to be ascertained. I have an idea what it is, and the gentleman has an idea.

Now, the amendment to this bill is to make this appropriation available everywhere in the United States for these three favored articles—wheat, barley, and oats—for seed. I think I have it right, have I not?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, I want to call the attention of the committee to what has been done and what is the necessity for this appropriation. Nearly a year ago, under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], \$2,500,000 was appropriated for use anywhere in the country for seed. I think I am correct in that. Now, that is a revolving fund. It has not been expended, except in part. Now, \$4,000,000 is appropriated in the urgent deficiency bill for the same purpose, a revolving fund, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture. He goes to work, no doubt, and has organized and ascertained about the wants of the different parts of the country. Now, what is the use of appropriating this \$10,000,000?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If I can get a little more time, I have no objection to yielding.

Mr. LEVER. I just want to ask a question.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. HELVERING. The gentleman says these appropriations were made under the direction of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON. The first one was. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture advocated both of them.

Mr. HELVERING. And they were general in their nature—all over the country.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. And they were not pork barrel then, were they?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. They covered the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I was a pioneer boy. I know something about the hardships of pioneering. I know the want of markets. I know it was worth a man's life to clear 80 acres of land of that heavy timber in the Wabash country. There never was better manhood in the same number of people on this earth than among the pioneers in the settlement of the West. They had good manhood. They never were debauched by getting something for nothing. They drank sassafras tea and spicewood tea, and ate corn bread, and lived in lean-tos, and they raised strong, healthy children, and they cut down the forest and founded a civilization. You may say, "Oh, they have had such droughts out in this western country!" Why, good God, they had too much rain in the early spring all over the northern section of the corn belt. But they planted the corn. There was not one-quarter of a crop raised in Michigan. There was not much of a crop raised in Minnesota or in northern Illinois. The corn was of poor quality and much of it of little value, and down in central Illinois, the best corn country on earth, 25 per cent of the corn was soft, and they could not make alcohol or whisky or beer out of it. The bad season came, and we could not get transportation, and the corn spoiled. Now let us be honest with each other. Is it necessary to relieve Montana? Then let us relieve her. There is plenty of money to relieve Montana, to furnish seed wheat, barley, and oats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think I shall talk again about this bill. I should like really to have 10 minutes.

Mr. NORTON. I make the request for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Now, what is the fact? Does Minnesota want anything from this proposed legislation? No. I speak with assured certainty. Does Michigan want anything? No. Does Wisconsin want anything? No. Does North Dakota want anything? No. Does South Dakota? No. Now, that is as far as I can go, but I have good authority so far as I have gone. Then there is by this bill an additional \$10,000,000 to be spent for seed wheat, oats, and barley for Montana and Idaho—anything else?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. North Dakota.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, North Dakota is cared for.

Mr. FERRIS. How?

Mr. CANNON. By an act of the legislature, and the money is substantially expended. I asked a North Dakotan about it, and he said North Dakota was cared for by action of their legislature. The same is true of South Dakota. I will tell you about this if you want to know. This is a competition among some of our people in two or three States, who are scared to death about this new organization that believes the farmers never get anything. It is farming the farmers for the benefit of self-constituted champions of the farmer for the political benefit of the champions. That is the truth about it. [Applause and laughter.] There is a revolving fund for the Secretary of Agriculture, with his force all organized, \$2,500,000 for a year. The money is not all spent. It is a revolving fund. It is back there still—\$2,500,000, and \$4,000,000 added by the vote of this House for the same purpose, a revolving fund. Yet we say, "The poor farmer!" My God, do you know that one-third of the farmers in this country own more than one-third of the wealth of the country? I am speaking by the book, of things whereof I know, if there is any truth in figures and statistics.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I will; but make it short.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman distinguish any difference between the appropriation of the \$2,500,000 that he speaks of and the \$4,000,000 which provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seed and sell for cash, and this bill which authorizes him to make advances on time? Does the gentleman see any difference between those two propositions?

Mr. CANNON. That is a foolish question. If you want to give it to these people, most of those who want these advances can get them now. Nine-tenths of them can get them now.

Mr. NORTON. What are you going to do with the other tenth?

Mr. CANNON. If you want to pauperize nine-tenths of the people, or nineteen-twentieths of the people, give them something for nothing. [Applause.] You can increase the paupers. Oh, I defend the pioneer. I was one of the pioneers, from the time I was 4 years old until I grew up to manhood. They have got good stuff out West. I defend them against political demagoguery. [Applause.] Who introduced the bill? Why, our friend, wonderfully bright, wonderfully handsome. Why, good God, he does not belong to the Democratic Party. He does not belong to the Republican Party, although he sits on our side of the House. He introduced a \$50,000,000 bill. And so we go, competing with him and others like him. He is an estimable gentleman. Do not take it that I am speaking disrespectfully of him. I am calling by their right names political policies that I think are vicious. That is what I am doing. You appropriated \$20,000,000,000 in the last session of Congress—appropriations and authorizations. Now you are running at railroad speed, appropriating, appropriating, with \$4,000,000,000 to be collected by taxation by the 1st of July next, and the taxation comes from all sections of the country. Another liberty loan is just being started. Our boys are in the trenches. Eight hundred and forty million dollars for aeroplanes. It is claimed—God knows whether it is true or not; I do not know—that it has not resulted in aeroplanes. I am not saying that it has not so resulted. But here you come, with all these things coming upon us, with insurance of \$10,000 for every soldier at a nominal rate. That is all right. I voted for it. I believe in it. We doubled their pay. I voted for it. I believed in that.

Good God! Let us be practical, and let us stop playing these little peanut politics—everybody getting up and crying, "I am going to stand by the farmer; oh, yes!" Mr. Chairman, I have an agricultural district. Two-thirds of my district are farmers. I was a farmer when I was a boy myself.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does the gentleman distinguish between the farmers living in Illinois, all of whom are probably wealthy, and homesteaders on the public domain?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the homesteader, in my judgment, is not asking for this, if it is a gift. I do not believe there is a homesteader in Montana, if he were to raise wheat and had to borrow the seed, who could not get that seed from the citizens of Montana or the Department of Agriculture if he possessed good manhood. You do not want to go through the form of giving something to somebody who will not utilize it. I am not speaking harshly of the people of Montana. I have every sympathy with them and with everyone else. A homesteader! Do you think he would want \$450 for seed wheat? A man settles on a homestead of 160 acres, and does he want \$450 for seed wheat? I want to say something further about this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wish the gentleman would say something about these spring-wheat areas, including wheat and oats and barley.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, wheat and oats and barley are very important; cotton is very important; everything is very important that is raised on the farm. What I want to speak about is the provision in this bill that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be expended for the payment of administrative expenses. Mr. Chairman, the man in the trench, the man in the Army, the man on the railway, the man in the mine, the farmer on the farm, and the pioneer doing his part are all doing well; but, good heavens, think of the men whom you see in Washington, think of the men whom you see in New York, whom you see in Illinois, whom you see all over the country who are rushing here wanting to be employed to do something for the Government other than to go to war. If you keep on you will have so many people here and elsewhere employed by the Government that you will not have anybody to draft or to enlist. You will have less people to farm, you will have less people to build ships. The greatest industry that I know of is the industry that brings them here. The greatest industry that I know of is this, and it brings the least profit to the Government. Let us keep our heads, gentlemen. If the \$4,000,000 plus the two and a half million dollars' revolving fund are not enough now, when the spring planting commences in March in the spring-wheat belt, and March is almost over and April upon us, and the spring wheat is probably in large part in the ground, then what is to become of us or the farmers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes in connection with that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon these two amendments and the substitute close at the end of 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], and, if I deem it necessary, 5 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the committee was addressing the committee a few moments ago he made an appeal to the House to vote down the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] upon the ground that this was not a "pork-barrel" bill, and in his remarks he stated that he thought we had gone far enough in conferring general powers on the Secretary of Agriculture in the disbursement of these funds. Yet in this bill, whose benefits are confined to a small area of the country, the gentleman himself and his committee, presumptively with his approval, has brought out a bill that provides for the laying out of \$7,500,000 under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate, himself giving the very widest and amplest powers conceivable.

In addition to this it is provided that a lien upon the crop shall be considered sufficient security, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. What is your lien? Under that language it is nothing. As far as the legal effect of it is concerned, your advances to these farmers are gifts unless the farmer wishes to pay them back or has property out of which a judgment can be satisfied. Why? Because your act does not provide for a positive lien. This crop will pass into the hands of purchasers free from the incumbrance of such a lien unless you specifically provide that the lien shall follow the crop into the hands of purchasers, which would defeat the very purpose of the bill. So there is only one way to enforce your security, and that is for the Government to demand payment before the sale of the crop, and if not paid, to enforce the lien; and there is no man here who believes that the Government will do any such thing. As a legal proposition, your provision for a so-called lien is without any effect, and as a practical proposition, in my opinion your bill provides, in substance, that the Secretary of Agriculture, if he will—and it is all left to him, though the committee is not in favor of conferring broad powers—may advance this money to the tune of \$7,500,000 without a bit of security on earth.

Is that all? No. This bill proposes furthermore to constitute your Secretary of Agriculture a labor agent to go out in all the sections of the country and drum up labor to go to work in the planting and harvesting of this wheat crop. They will come to the South, they will come to the East, to the North, and West with the boys gone from the farms into the Army, with your farm labor—I know it is true of the South, and I judge it is true in other parts of the country—gone to the great manufacturing centers to take advantage of the high wages. There is not a farming section of the United States that has enough labor now, and yet you are going practically to direct your Secretary of Agriculture to constitute himself a labor agent to go into sections of the country already depleted of labor and offer the inducement of railroad fare to take away their labor to this favored section of the country. And I prophesy what will be the result. You will have the greatest wave of discontent, the greatest wave of revolt against this thing all over the country that you ever saw. Every day I get letters from the South stating that the conditions are such that while the Government is calling upon the farmer to increase production that he can not do it because the boys are gone and the negroes that constitute the great body of labor in the South have gone to the industrial centers in the East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. I would ask for one minute more in order to finish the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Would the Secretary of Agriculture in drumming up labor run into competition with the Secretary of Labor, also drumming up labor for the same purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request for one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VENABLE. The answer to that is that when you provide \$7,500,000 to plant and harvest a particular crop in a particular section of the country and couple with that an appropriation to get labor, it is tantamount to a direction that the Secretary of Agriculture must go out and get this labor and plant and reap that particular crop.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. While the Secretary of Labor is also drumming up labor.

Mr. VENABLE. Not farm labor. They have not done it, and I hope will not do it. But you are directing—you are taking all discretion from the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. VENABLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture together for the last eight months have been doing this very thing, and that the President of the United States gave to them \$800,000 from the sum which was given to him for the purpose of mobilizing labor, and they have been doing that all last summer?

Mr. VENABLE. Going into rural sections to get farm labor?

Mr. RUBEY. Doing the same thing we are authorizing to be done here.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman mean to say they are going to the rural sections of this country to get farm labor?

Mr. RUBEY. No; and I do not mean to say they will do it under this bill.

Mr. VENABLE. I do.

Mr. RUBEY. They will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I say that the Secretary of Agriculture must necessarily go to the farming sections to get farm labor for the planting and reaping of this proposed crop in the favored section of the West for the reason that he must go either to the country or to the cities. Those in the cities who are familiar with or who will engage in farm labor are those who have left the country or rural communities because they have been attracted by the high wages paid in industrial trades and manufacturing plants. They have good places paying high wages. No one is idle who wishes to work. Do the gentlemen of this committee think that the wages offered by these wheat farmers in the spring-wheat area will be so attractive as to induce men who have already rejected similar wages to take more attractive places in the cities to again go to the country? Certainly not. Perforce, then, the Secretary of Agriculture must get his labor supply from those already in the country engaged in farm labor, and this is sought to be done by offering free transportation. If this reasoning be true, it comes to this: That the Secretary of Agriculture is practically directed to go into the farming communities of the country, already depleted of necessary labor, and induce this labor by the attraction of free transportation and the allurements of a promised land where homestead is possible, to leave other sections of the country to work for farmers of the so-called spring-wheat area who are, according to the confession of this bill, unable to obtain credit from local business men or financial institutions to the extent of the price of their seed wheat.

In every agricultural section of the country there is a scarcity of labor. The farmer boys have been taken into the Army. Thousands have gone to the cities to work in industrial plants, attracted there by the high wages offered.

Now, it is suggested to have the Government engage in the business of taking away the labor that remains in order to provide for one particular section of the country.

The growing of wheat is necessary. So is the growing of corn. We must eat either wheat or corn or some other substitute. It is necessary that corn be grown in order that we may substitute it for wheat so that the wheat may be sent abroad. What profits it if to grow wheat we destroy corn so that we are forced to eat the wheat and so will have none to send abroad? Are we any better off than if we had not grown the wheat?

But the crass injustice of the thing! Here it is proposed to send the Government out on a mission of taking away the little labor that is left to the farmers of other sections of the country, producing products just as essential as wheat. Corn is as essential as wheat because it substitutes for wheat that we send abroad. Cotton is essential because it is necessary if we fight

this war at all. But more than this. Contrary to all theories heretofore held, it is proposed and the Secretary of Agriculture is practically instructed to advance \$450 to every man who says that he intends to plant wheat and whose standing in the community is such that his neighbors will not trust him for this amount. In short, lack of financial credit is made a sine qua non of governmental relief and the bill is careful to provide that no security may be taken if the Secretary of Agriculture so desires. What security is there that the man who gets the money will plant wheat? What security is there that he will not invest in oil of joy which maketh temporarily glad the heart of man and converteth him temporarily into an ass?

These proposed borrowers admittedly can not get credit in their local communities, else why the necessity of Government aid? If without credit, it must be because they either lack character or assets out of which a judgment can be enforced. If such is their condition, what security can the Government take which will insure either the planting of the crop, the repayment of the loan, or the payment of simply interest on the debt, which, by the way, a generous committee does not provide for in the bill?

It has been asked, What difference, if any, exists between this proposed gift and the appropriation for the purchase of seed carried in a former bill? I will answer, The greatest difference in the world.

The former bill provided for the purchase of seed by the Government which was to be sold to the farmer. This provides for the gift of seed, not for the purpose of introducing improved varieties in which the whole country will benefit, but any old seed for the purpose of getting a crop. In the first bill the Government furnishes a facility for getting a thing—a perfectly legitimate function. In the second the Government practically makes a gift. As I see it it is proper for the Government to make available a source of supply without loss to the Government and without taxing the citizens for the benefit of a particular class, furnishing facilities, in other words, for the doing of a thing. As I see it it is not proper to make a gift such as is proposed in this bill, as I construe it.

My colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, interpolated a remark the significance of which was that this bill proposed to have the Secretary of Agriculture go out in the country and solicit farm labor, while the Secretary of Labor was soliciting labor for other purposes, thus presenting the admirable spectacle of departments of Government competing with one another, with the Secretary of Agriculture having the advantage of a fund for holding forth the inducement of free transportation to the laborer that he may go out West and work for a farmer who can not get credit for enough money to buy his seed. I trust that this suggestion by my colleague of the effect of this bill will receive consideration at the hands of this committee.

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but permit me to say to gentlemen of the committee who live in sections of the country other than the so-called spring-wheat belt, that when the Government in the guise of a labor agent comes into your communities where labor on the farms is already much too scarce, offering inducements of free transportation, appealing to the wanderlust in men, urging them to go to unseen countries, even though it be to work for men who admittedly can not raise \$450 or less, this measure is destined to be about as popular as a polecat at a nigger camp meeting, and its supporters will not be altogether in the odor of sanctity.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to me by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in having this five minutes, although taking the opposite view from that which he takes. We all love the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and we have confidence in him and in his leadership. I regret that I can not follow him now and approve the position he takes on this bill. I am in favor of striking out this word "spring," so that the bill will not be confined to the spring-wheat area. I am in favor of making this a general proposition that will apply to Maine, Texas, California, or to Virginia, or every other State, and leave it to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine where it is necessary to use these funds or where these funds can be used to best advantage. That would make it a national proposition. In this form, in my judgment, it would be more acceptable to the people of the United States. In its present form it is sectional. Now, then, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture said, as I understood him, that he would vote against this bill if the word "spring" were stricken out and this bill was made to apply to every State. I wish to remind the gentleman that only last year, in April or May, he introduced what is known as the food-survey bill. As chairman

of the Committee on Agriculture, he reported the bill favorably. He conducted the measure through the House. And that bill as he introduced it and as it passed the House contained a provision appropriating about \$6,000,000 to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in aiding farmers to purchase seeds. It authorized the sale of seeds to farmers on credit, and to farmers in any section of the United States. Now he says he can not support this bill if it is made to apply anywhere except in the spring-wheat area. It strikes me that the position the gentleman takes now is inconsistent with the position he held on the food-survey bill. In view of this fact, the argument the gentleman makes should not carry the weight which ordinarily goes with views which he always presents to the House with such clearness, candor, and force.

There are some distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the House opposing this measure, whether it applies to the spring-wheat area only or to the United States generally. I have great respect for their views, but they are clearly wrong. The trouble is they have no true conception of the wheat country of the West. Now, the fact is this: In the western half of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota approximately one-third of the wheat of the United States is produced. This is in what is known as the semiarid regions. Crop failures there are possibly more frequent than in some other sections. Nevertheless, one year after another these sections produce a large percentage of all our wheat. We can not supply ourselves and our allies with wheat without a liberal production from these sections. To aid the farmers out there to produce the largest amount of wheat is both wise and patriotic, for without the wheat produced by these farmers we would not have a bushel of wheat to export unless we took it from what our own people needed.

But the provisions of this bill as reported would confine the use of the money appropriated to the spring-wheat area. Suppose this bill passes as reported—we aid the spring-wheat States. Suppose that in certain sections of Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and other States there should be a failure this year in the wheat crop. The wheat farmers in these winter-wheat sections would be in exactly the same condition that the spring-wheat farmers are now. They would not be able to purchase seed wheat. The local banks could not furnish the necessary credit; but Congress might be adjourned. The Secretary of Agriculture could extend no assistance. The Government would be in the position of discriminating against one section of the country. This would be bad enough, but the worst of it would be the wheat acreage would be reduced millions of acres.

Now, this bill should be made general in its application to the country, and it should be made so as to apply to crops sown this season. Why legislate for a day? Why not look ahead? Why not plan for the future? Why not take a comprehensive view? Why not broaden our vision so as to include at least the war period? Why not pass an act that will enable the farmers to secure the necessary credit to purchase seed at any time during the war?

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it unwise to have this lien in this bill to make the farmer give the first lien on his growing crop?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not.

Mr. HOWARD. Which will destroy his credit. Do you not think we ought to do away with that?

Mr. MORGAN. Many, many times in the West, in the home-stead districts, the railroads have furnished wheat by millions of bushels to the farmers. Can not the United States do what a railroad corporation can do?

Gentlemen, strike out "spring" and make this a national measure, and the people of the United States will approve it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes of the time of the committee, and then I intend to ask for a vote on these two amendments and the substitute therefor, and then, if the committee is willing, we shall rise and go home.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] seems to think that the Committee on Agriculture, at least its chairman, is inconsistent because of the fact that last year in the food-production bill we brought in a proposition appropriating \$6,000,000 for seed to be furnished farmers for cash or on credit. I have not made any complaint about this bill, because it is a credit proposition, although as a peace proposition I would not vote for it for half a second. The complaint I am making now is against these two amendments which are endeavoring to take from this bill its real character and, to my mind, make it of a character smacking of "pork-barrel" legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. No; I can not yield. As I said a moment ago, there is but one purpose in the mind of the committee, and that is to furnish this seed on credit to certain sections of the country where the evidence before the committee shows that the situation is critical and that by furnishing of these seeds we might possibly, and very probably, increase the production of wheat in this country in the spring-wheat area as much as from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels. The committee recognizes, of course, that the bread line of this country across to its own soldiers and the soldiers of its allies is as absolutely as important to be held intact as it is important for Haig and Pershing to hold their line intact in this great struggle which is going on.

Now, that is all the committee had in mind. And I want to repeat, that if I thought this committee was going to be unwise enough to throw this proposition wide open, and say to wheat growers here and there, in Virginia, in South Carolina, and in Oklahoma, and in other places, whence there is coming absolutely no demand for this legislation, and giving them the opportunity to run to the Treasury and buy a few bushels of wheat on credit, hamper the administration of this law, and make it almost impossible to administer it with anything like effectiveness, I would vote against this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. RAKER. What particular territory now is involved and that would be included in this bill?

Mr. LEVER. The spring-wheat area of the United States; that would include North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, probably a portion of Washington, and Idaho.

Mr. RAKER. And with the language of the bill as it now stands, if it went through, the rest of the country would not be able to get any wheat?

Mr. LEVER. No; I would not say that. I will say that the rest of the country would not get the benefit of this bill. The rest of the country has all the wheat it wants and can have all it wants.

Mr. RAKER. I mean, to get the benefit of this bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is in favor of limiting the operation of this bill to the particular section of the country where there is special need of this favor?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely.

Mr. STEAGALL. Then let me ask the gentleman another question. The amendment now pending is to strike out the words "spring wheat areas," is it not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. With those words out, would not the bill read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. And that is just the point.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I ask one other question? Then, if there is special need for this legislation in any part of the United States, ought not the Secretary of Agriculture to be permitted to grant the favors there as well as to a particularly limited section of the country where there is special need? [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, of course, realizes that the time for the planting of fall wheat has gone by. The only area which can be sown to wheat now is the spring-wheat area in this section that I described. Now, if you throw this open and cut the bridle reins and turn the horse loose, every farmer in South Carolina that thinks he ought to buy wheat on credit, whether he ought to do it or not, every farmer in Pennsylvania who thinks that it is up to him to get wheat on credit from the Government next fall, will be coming in here, flooding the Department of Agriculture and hampering the administration of this law and defeating its purpose. I therefore hope the committee will vote it down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. A few moments ago, in response to a question by myself, the gentleman stated that there had been a drought in this section which had cut down the crop of oats and barley, which are included in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think I said "wheat."

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the gentleman said "oats and barley." Now, referring to the record, Wisconsin last year produced 92,000,000 bushels, Minnesota 120,000,000 bushels, and North Dakota 61,000,000 bushels of oats. What became of those oats if they have no seed out there?

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the average yield of wheat in these States—and if I

am wrong in these figures I hope the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] will correct me—this year was about 4½ bushels per acre. Is that right?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Five and a half bushels.

Mr. LEVER. As against 10 or 11 bushels to the acre heretofore.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If they do what the gentleman seeks to prevent and you allow these other sections to get the benefit of this act, will it not result in increasing production?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not understand, because he is from Boston and does not know anything about farming [laughter], that the fall sowing of wheat has passed long ago, and we have 42,000,000 acres now in wheat. This is to take care of next year.

Mr. WALSH. Could they not do that in barley and oats?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And would there not be production of those products?

Mr. LEVER. Not so much as wheat.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman admits that the Pennsylvania farmer who does not need seed wheat might come to the Department of Agriculture and get it on credit. Is not that the vice of the bill?

Mr. LEVER. I admitted that in my opening statement—that this is not a bill that anybody would support in peace times. But I have tried to show that there is a situation existing that ought to attract the attention of this House.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be reported, as there seems to be some confusion in regard to it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is there not an amendment pending to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Just one amendment and a substitute pending? I understood that there was an amendment to the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute is spoken of as an amendment.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have that reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HELVERING: On page 3, line 16, strike out the words "spring wheat."

Substitute offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 43.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEVER and Mr. WINGO to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise. [Cries of "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not proper to vote upon the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING]? We only voted on the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was the vote by tellers announced?

The CHAIRMAN. It was. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 60.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. GARNER. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEVER and Mr. WINGO to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 78.

So the committee refused to rise.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Texas moves to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Is a motion in order to lay this motion on the table?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion would not be in order.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, is this motion debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. LUNN. Then I want to debate it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the motion to strike out the enacting clause is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in error. As the Chair is advised, the motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. HOWARD, and others demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 67.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas and Mr. SHERLEY demanded tellers. Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. RUBEY and Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 65.

A MEMBER. One more in the affirmative, Mr. Chairman.

ANOTHER MEMBER. One more in the negative, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is bound by the report of the tellers. On this vote the ayes are 74, the noes are 65. The motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause is agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for H. R. 7795 to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment in order to enable me to present a conference report?

Mr. LEVER. I will withhold the motion for a moment.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. SIMS presented the following conference report, which was ordered to be printed under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 419).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of

a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same.

T. W. SIMS,

SAM RAYBURN,

S. E. WINSLOW,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,

HOKE SMITH,

REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SEED GRAIN FOR FARMERS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. What would be the effect of the adjournment upon the bill reported from the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. None whatever. The first thing in the morning would be the vote on the report of the committee.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record my speech on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SHOUSE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEY) there were—ayes 69, noes 78.

Accordingly the motion to adjourn was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken.

Mr. LEVER. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUBEY. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-one Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SHERLEY. I make the point that that motion is not in order. The House has not transacted any business since that motion was voted down.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 120, nays 123, not voting 188, as follows:

YEAS—120.

Alexander	Doelling	Jones, Va.	Riordan
Almon	Doughton	Kinchelee	Robinson
Ashbrook	Dupré	Larsen	Rogers
Bacharach	Eagan	Lazaro	Rubey
Bankhead	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Sanford
Barkley	Elliott	Leibach	Saunders, Va.
Bell	Fisher	Leshner	Sears
Black	Gallagher	Lonergan	Sherley
Blanton	Gallivan	Lufkin	Sherwood
Brand	Garner	McAndrews	Shouse
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tenn.	McKeown	Sisson
Browning	Glass	Maher	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Glynn	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Merritt	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	Montague	Tillman
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, Ala.	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Oldfield	Venable
Cannon	Harrison, Va.	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson
Cantrill	Hastings	Overstreet	Walker
Carter, Okla.	Heflin	Park	Walsh
Chandler, Okla.	Helm	Parker, N. J.	Watkins
Church	Holland	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Connally, Tex.	Howard	Porter	Wetly
Connely, Kans.	Huddleston	Quin	Wilson, Tex.
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Ragsdale	Wingo
Dale, N. Y.	Husted	Rainey	Winslow
Delaney	Hutchinson	Raker	Woodyard
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Ramsey	Wright
Domulick	Jones, Tex.	Rayburn	Young, Tex.

NAYS—144

So the motion to order the previous question was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On the vote:
Mr. STEELE (for) with Mr. LA FOLLETTE (against).
Mr. STEVENSON (for) with Mr. STEENERSON (against).
Until further notice:
Mr. SCHALL with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. SMALL with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.
Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. KEARNS.
Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. MUDD.
Mr. ASWELL with Mr. PARKER of New York.
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. BURNETT with Mr. HULL of Iowa.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. VOIGT.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. MCKENZIE.
Mr. COADY with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. COLLIER with Mr. BRITTEN.
Mr. DECKER with Mr. BROWNE.
Mr. DENT with Mr. MCCORMICK.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. BUTLER.
Mr. HARDY with Mr. DARROW.
Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. HODS with Mr. ELSTON.

Osborne	Rucker	Snell	Vestal
Parker, N. Y.	Russell	Snook	Voigt
Pratt	Scott, Iowa	Sterling, Ill.	Waldow
Purnell	Scott, Mich.	Summers	Walton
Ramseyer	Shackleford	Sweet	Welling
Randall	Shallenberger	Swift	Wheeler
Rankin	Sinnott	Switzer	White, Ohio
Robbins	Slemp	Taylor, Colo.	Wingo
Romjue	Sloan	Temple	Woods, Iowa
Rowe	Smith, Idaho	Tillman	Young, N. Dak.
Rubey	Smith, Mich.	Timberlake	Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wason

NOT VOTING—180.

Anderson	Francis	Lenroot	Sanders, Ind.
Anthony	Frear	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Freeman	Littlepage	Sanders, N. Y.
Austin	Fuller, Ill.	Longworth	Schall
Blackmon	Fuller, Mass.	McCormick	Scott, Pa.
Booher	Gandy	McCulloch	Scully
Borland	Gard	McKenzie	Sells
Britten	Garland	McKinley	Siegel
Browne	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sims
Burnett	Gillett	McLemore	Slayden
Burroughs	Good	Madden	Small
Butler	Goodall	Magee	Smith, C. B.
Caldwell	Gould	Mann	Smith, T. F.
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Meeker	Snyder
Caraway	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Minn.	Steagall
Carew	Greene, Vt.	Miller, Wash.	Stedman
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	Mondell	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Moore, Pa.	Steenerson
Classon	Griffin	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Hamill	Morin	Sterling, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Hamilton, Mich.	Mott	Stevenson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamlin	Mudd	Stinson
Copley	Hardy	Neely	Strong
Costello	Harrison, Miss.	Nelson	Sullivan
Crago	Hayes	Nicholls, S. C.	Talbott
Curry, Cal.	Heaton	Olney	Templeton
Darrow	Heintz	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Davidson	Hensley	Overmyer	Thompson
Decker	Hersey	Padgett	Tinkham
Dent	Hollingsworth	Palge	Towner
Denton	Hood	Peters	Van Dyke
Dies	Houston	Platt	Vare
Doremus	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Volstead
Drane	Igoe	Porter	Ward
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	Watkins
Ellsworth	Juul	Powers	Watson, Va.
Elston	Kahn	Price	Weaver
Estopinal	Kearns	Reavis	Webb
Fairchild, B. L.	Keboe	Reed	Whaley
Fairchild, G. W.	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	White, Me.
Fess	Kettner	Rodenberg	Williams
Flood	Key, Ohio	Rose	Wilson, Ill.
Flynn	Kitchin	Rouse	Wilson, La.
Fordney	La Follette	Rowland	Wise
Foss	LaGuardia	Sabath	Wood, Ind.

So the motion to strike out the enacting clause was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. TINKHAM (for) with Mr. WASON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DRANE with Mr. CLASSON.

Mr. MOON with Mr. FREEMAN.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. POU with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. JUUL.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present in the Hall listening?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I was present, but I guess I was not listening very well or I would have heard my name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already voted, and voted in the affirmative. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I did not vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will scratch his name off if he did not vote. Does the gentleman want to vote?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; I did not vote and I want to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; I was not; if I was listening, I did not hear my name called, and I do not know whether I was listening or not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. BURNETT. No; I do not think I got here in time.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The report of the committee is not agreed to, and the bill is automatically referred back to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union [applause], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will take the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, pending that may I make a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the pending bill?

The SPEAKER. Do it after we get through with this. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will take the chair until Mr. POU can return.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7795 with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title:

H. R. 9867. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11047) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 418), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 11085) to amend section 3 of an act approved June 25, 1910, amending paragraph 2 of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization of the aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11086) to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act so that maturity of paper drawn for

agricultural purposes or based on live-stock may extend to one year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 11087) to prescribe the personnel of the Army Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps and the conditions under which they may be retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11088) providing for the construction of ice piers in the harbor of Louisa, Ky., on the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNING: Resolution (H. Res. 292) to pay to John E. Nicol, clerk to the late John H. Capstick, a Representative in Congress, \$166.66; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution (H. Res. 293) providing for the immediate consideration of bills on the calendar from the Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 294) to pay Gardner Anthony, son of W. H. Anthony, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to six months' compensation; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 269) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1918 and 1919; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 11089) granting an increase of pension to George C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11091) granting an increase of pension to Stewart N. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11092) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Dysard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 11093) granting a pension to Edward B. Bangs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11094) granting an increase of Pension to William Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11095) granting an increase of pension to William Mitchell, alias William Terow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11096) granting an increase of pension to John T. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 11097) granting an increase of pension to Edward Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11098) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11099) granting a pension to Isabel B. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Milwaukee Association of Life Underwriters against tax in war revenue bill on certain life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the faculty of Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa, protesting against the second-class postage amendment to the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Rozlene, president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, relative to unexpended balance of money granted the organization by the Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the Philadelphia Annual Conference pledging unswerving loyalty to the President and our country in the successful prosecution of the war; urging immediate war prohibition, the establishment of a dry zone in Philadelphia, and the enactment of laws meting out to German propagandists and traitorous Americans the full penalty of spies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the Shut-in Society of New York City, asking for the repeal of the periodical postage increase law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of Joel McCallister and C. A. Shank, of Clarkston, Wash., on maintaining chaplains in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Devils Lake Journal of Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Illinois Women's Clubs, favoring a kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of T. W. Fisher, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Warnock & Sons, of Loveland, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. Dawn, Ida B. Thompson, Mrs. W. E. Mason, Joy L. Reichelt, Mrs. W. B. Floyd, Mrs. Etta K. Siple, and 11 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of W. W. Scott and 50 men of the Kirkwood Presbyterian Church, of Bridgeport, Ohio, favoring closing American saloons during the present war, and to prevent export of grains to foreign countries to be used in manufacture of distilled or malt liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of certain farmers of the Northwest through the Farm, Stock, and Home, of Minneapolis, asking that the price of 1918 wheat be raised to \$2.75 per bushel; also asking that the draft be revised to the end that farm labor be largely exempted; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 28, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we lift up our souls unto Thee. In the midst of the world war we put our trust in Thee. At this critical hour in the awful conflict we look more steadfastly to Thee. O Thou God of battles, Thou God of Moses, and of Gideon, and of David in the battles of long ago, direct our cause, and let not our enemies triumph over us. O God, in Thy name we stand for the great principles which Thou hast projected in the world. We stand for justice and righteousness for all men and for all nations; and we look to Thee as the great Captain of our salvation to direct us aright.

O Thou, who art mighty in battle, save our cause. Give grace and wisdom and courage to all our leaders and lead on our armies to honor and to victory and to a lasting peace. Speed on the triumph of the day when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth and there shall be the resurrection of a new day, with peace on earth and good will to men. We ask it in the name of Christ, the Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in extra session, 1918, relative to the inclusion of the State of South Dakota in a list of certain States affected by legislation appropriating money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed, grain, and feed for stock. I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota assembled in extraordinary session at the State capital, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That whereas there has been a bill introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 7795) to appropriate money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed grain and feed for stock in certain enumerated Northwestern States, of which South Dakota is specifically named, as one needing such Government aid;